UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. VI WINTER, 1954 No. 4

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

St. Augustine and the Unity of the Church

The Evanston Assembly - An Evaluation

EDWARD HANAHOE, S.A.

The Mission of the Chair of Unity Octave

JOSEPH GILL, S.J.

Reflections on "The Conversion of England"

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

The Reunion Formula of Hormisdas - A Reprint of Adrian Fortescue's Essay

ECUMENISM AND REUNION - AROUND THE WORLD

BOOK REVIEWS - INDEX FOR 1954

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, NEW YORK

UNITAS

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW
ORGAN OF THE UNITAS ASSOCIATION
ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDITION

Published by the *Unitas Association* of Rome. Edited by Charles Boyer, S.J., Prefect of Studies and Dean of the Theological Faculty, Gregorian Pontifical University, Rome.

With Ecclesiastical Approval

Inquiries concerning the work of the *Unitas Association*, and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor:

Rev. Fr. CHARLES BOYER, S.J.,
UNITAS
Piazza Farnese 96, Rome, Italy.

Communications and inquiries concerning the English Language Edition should be addressed to the Secretary:

Rev. Fr. GERMANUS TOMAINO, S.A.
UNITAS
Piazza Farnese 96, Rome, Italy.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Subscriptions for the United States and Canada should be addressed to:

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS
Peekskill, New York, U.S.A.

Single Copy — 50 cents . . . Annual Subscription $2.00

Subscriptions for Great Britain and Ireland should be addressed to:

DUCKETT
The Catholic Book Centre
140, Strand
London, W.C. 2, England

Single Copy — 4 shillings . . . Annual Subscription — 15 shillings

UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association — English Language Edition

Vol. VI — WINTER, 1954 — No. 4

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

St. Augustine and the Unity of the Church

The Evanston Assembly - An Evaluation

EDWARD HANAHOE, S.A.

The Mission of the Chair of Unity Octave

JOSEPH GILL, S.J.

Reflections on "The Conversion of England"

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

The Reunion Formula of Hormisdas - A Reprint of Adrian Fortescue's Essay

ECUMENISM AND REUNION - AROUND THE WORLD

BOOK REVIEWS - INDEX FOR 1954

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, NEW YORK

Imprimatur:

✠ Aloysius Traglia
Archiepus Caesarien Vicegerens

December 1954

SAINT AUGUSTINE AND THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

For many years Saint Augustine dedicated the better part of his time and resources in defending the unity of the Church against the schism of the Donatists. In his day the latter group had been separated from the Church for about a century. Originally its adherents had refused to recognize a bishop of Carthage called Cecilian because, they said, he had been consecrated by bishops who had delivered up the Sacred Books during the persecution.

The history of the Donatists is a very instructive one. At the beginning it was only a schism. A certain Donatus of Numidia rebels against Cecilian and installs another bishop, Majorinus, at Carthage. But in order to sustain the schism, however, he is constrained to cross over into heresy, opposing one doctrine against the other. According to him, the validity of an ordination (as of all the Sacraments) depends upon the virtue of the minister who confers it. Moreover, anyone who remains in communion with a bishop consecrated as was Cecilian has withdrawn from the true Church. Hence, he eventually comes to consider that the Donatist Church alone is the one true Church.

Only too soon, however, divisions begin to arise within the sect and go to make up groups of an increasing restrictive nature, each of which lays claim to the title of the one true Church. At first they go their own way; then they construct a doctrine· and finally, the same principle that was the cause of the original separation makes division upon division spring up among the separatists. Such is the immanent law of schism.

What will the Bishop of Hippo do to bring back to unity these Donatists who are troubling his diocese? He offers first of all to consider their grievances. He demonstrates that the accusations brought against those who had consecrated Cecilian do not correspond to the truth. Above all, he sustains the very important principle that the validity of the Sacraments does not depend upon the virtue of him who administers them. No matter who confers Baptism or an ordination, it is Jesus Christ who acts: it is His virtue that is transmitted by the minister who serves as His instrument. It does not matter how much the minister may be weighed down by the burden of his sins; the Sacrament preserves the virtue which comes to it from Christ Himself.

Saint Augustine repeats this truth a thousand times with an unwearied patience. This schism had no reason whatever for arising; and now, wishing to justify itself, it has altered the sacramental doctrine that the Church has so strenuously defended, even against the great Cyprian.

Driving from conclusion to conclusion, at what point have these schismatics arrived? Their pretension is that the Church has disappeared from the face of the earth, and that it no longer exists except in a corner of Africa. It is at this juncture that Augustine launches the powerful argument which he reiterates under so many different

aspects in the course of the ensuing controversy. The universal Catholic Church could not have perished: to her were made the promises of enduring forever and against her the gates of hell shall never prevail.

Prophesied through the length and breadth of the Old Testament, born upon the Cross of the Redemption, and made manifest before the world on the day of Pentecost, the Church of Christ is the one which is diffused over the face of the earth. She is universal, catholic, or else she does not exist. But she does exist because Christ, her Founder, has promised His assistance to her until the end of time. There is no need, then, to search any further; one has only to open his eyes. The true Church is not at all the obscure sect of the Donatists, set apart and subdivided in a limited region of Africa. She is the *catholica*, the one which reaches beyond the boundaries of the Roman Empire and which, far from restricting herself, continues to expand until she reaches the very ends of the earth.

The prophecies, the Gospel, the Acts of the Apostles, and her past history—all proclaim the universality, the unity, the indefectibility of the Church, and by the same token demonstrate how badly founded are the Donatist pretensions.

If he were living in our day, how would the great doctor present his argument? It cannot be doubted that he wished it to be valid for all time: neither the prophecies, nor the Gospel, nor Christ, nor the Spirit can change. The Church of Christ is Catholic: there is but one, and she has not ceased to exist. These are the firmly grounded points which ought to enlighten and formulate the reflections of every Christian.

We know that Newman, when still an Anglican, was deeply troubled when he read in an article by Wiseman on the Donatists this quotation of Augustine which sums up the argument of which we have spoken: "Securus judicat orbis terrarum"—it is without fear of error that the entire world passes judgment.

Perhaps at this point the reader might require one explanation of me: can a *catholic* Church be Roman? I answer: no, if that signifies a limitation to a certain territory, or to a human origin, to a racial privilege, or to a sacrilegious usurping. On the other hand, I say: yes, if that signifies that it is the Church of Peter, on whom Christ has in fact built His universal Church.

THE EDITOR

THE EVANSTON ASSEMBLY - AN EVALUATION

This past year has seen throughout the Catholic world a series of Marian celebrations, with those at Rome and at Lourdes being marked by an especial splendour. Non-Catholics, on the other hand, have concentrated their attention on the important congress held at Evanston, near Chicago. The erection at Amsterdam in 1948 of the World Council of Churches by the delegates of a large number of Protestant bodies is already well-known. This was the eventual result of a movement which started in 1910 with the avowed intention of bringing about a union within the ranks of the numerous denominations issuing from the Lutheran Reformation and ultimately of extending this unity to the whole Christian world. The Evanston Assembly, organized along the same lines as that of Amsterdam, was attended by about 1300 persons in different capacities: some were there as delegates, some as advisers, others as visitors or observers. The delegates, 300 strong, represented ultimately 132 "Churches" out of the 163 which planned to attend, and about 170 million people. The sessions lasted from August 15 till the 31st. The European press devoted much space to the reporting of it, while that in America covered the public manifestations in great detail.

Over and above the plenary sessions, there were six sectional meetings. A good deal of regret was expressed that the method followed was that of parliamentary debate. But one may indeed wonder whether any other was possible in the absence of a supreme authority.

We are in a position to present no more than a provisionary assessment of the conference, and even here we are limiting ourselves to the particular aspects that are of interest to us. In so doing, we are availing ourselves of the judgement passed by the Protestant press.

Many friends of the Ecumenical Movement were deeply disappointed by the principal theme chosen by the Evanston Assembly. This is not to deny that to proclaim Christ as the hope of the world is both opportune and efficacious. But one may question whether this is the particular task of an assembly concerning itself with the Ecumenical Movement. The purpose of the latter enterprise is to restore unity among Christians. Any other objective, however noble its character, only serves to turn it away from its primary end: it avoids its main responsibility and at the very least loses valuable time.

One is in full agreement with the assertion of Samuel Miller and of Jacqueline Faure in *Le Monde* of August 28 that: "the reunion of Christians is possible of attainment." Such is the basic proposition on which is constructed the institution of the World Council of Churches which held its second general conference at Evanston.

As an ideal this is admirable, but the impression is given that the delicate problem of doctrinal unity was being deliberately pushed into the background by the conference. Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, (1) one of the leading representatives of the World Council, sounded the keynote

(1) Dr. Visser 't Hooft is the Secretary General of the W.C.C.

at the beginning of the Assembly when he declared that the Council at Evanston would concern itself with questions which did not involve the matter of doctrine. The weakness of this position and its accompanying dangers are all too evident.

But the very nature of things swept this policy aside. Actually, according to what we know of the Evanston Assembly, its participants were very much concerned with the concept of unity. The evidence before their eyes of the serious nature of their disunion could not fail to raise the problem

Clearly, the 163 Churches which took part in the congress do not in fact represent as many distinct confessions. But *La Suisse* for September 10 certainly understates things considerably in asserting that there were only five confessional families present at the sessions. A correspondent of *Réforme* further reports (Sept. 4) the statement of one delegate that "We ought not to call 'Church' what is no more than the dispersion of the Body of Jesus Christ."

The Reverend Mark Boegner writes in *Le Figaro* of September 22: "Some have brought forward facts to show that, six years after the first Assembly at Amsterdam, the divisions within the non-Roman Churches are as great as ever. What is there in common, they ask, between the members of the Ethiopian Church and those of the Salvation Army? Between the archbishops of the Russian or Greek Orthodox and Methodist and Baptist ministers? And is there any real agreement between the Anglo-Catholics and Free Church groups?

This is the reason why, according to *La Gazette de Lausanne* for September 11: "Each has accepted as a personal obligation, seen more clearly than ever before, the imperious and sacred task of doing all he can, in whatever position God has placed him, to put an end to what is a scandal for the younger churches—the spectacle of division among the Churches of Christ."

It is obvious that this division appears in the discussions, even on as general and as simple a subject for Christians as that of Christ, Hope of the World. This is noted by M. Boegner in the same article quoted above:

"Others underline the clash of views between European and American theologians consequent upon their theological study of 'Christ, the sole Hope of the World'. The former insist on the eschatological character of this hope which will be fulfilled only upon the return of Christ; while the latter affirm that it is realised here below through the actual presence of Christ in His Church and in the life of the Christian. These deep differences, which spring not only from a temperament and a psychology that stand apart but also from a divergent interpretation of the data of Biblical Revelation, could not fail to catch the attention of all those present, among whom were 640 reporters accredited to the Assembly."

But this lack of union is particularly apparent and painful when these Christians wish to take part in a communal act of worship of

God. Communal worship is without doubt possible as long as it remains a question just of reading the Bible, singing the psalms or selected hymns, or even listening together to certain special sermons.

But when one comes to the heart of Christian worship, which is the Eucharist, divergent belief effectively obstructs any celebration in common: and there is no doubt that as long as this difference continues to exist, a "common" Communion would justly offend any conscience. But here is the comment of Edmond Grin in *La Gazette de Lausanne* (11 September) on this very question:

"At the Congress at Lausanne in 1927 no one even dreamt of a celebration of the Lord's Supper in common; there was too much mutual suspicion. At Edinburgh ten years later the four 'communions' took place simultaneously in four different sanctuaries. At Amsterdam the services followed one upon the other, with an invitation to the four other confessions, but... in rather vague terms. This time (at Evanston) there was the same procedure, but *each one*, several days before, received an invitation to take part in the service of the other. There is then a glimmer of hope which gains strength from the fact that, by the force of circumstances, the faithful of each confession are often less intransigent than their leaders. The participation in open communion services by young members of the Orthodox Church seems a pledge for the future."

"A pledge for the future"? Our comment would rather be: a sad warning.

The fact of young members of the Orthodox Church taking part with other groups in Holy Communion shows the danger Orthodoxy runs by putting on the garments of Protestantism under the pretext of mutual understanding and ecumenism.

M. Boegner (*Le Figaro,* September 11) reaches a much more measured conclusion: "Why should not the Lutherans and the Reformed Churches fearlessly turning back to the origin of their separation in the sixteenth century, discuss the possibility of studying together the doctrine of the Lord's Supper (Eucharist) and its Biblical foundation? Nothing would better ensure their going forward side by side on the road on which, before others perhaps, they will receive the grace to find the secret of Christian unity."

This is a point well taken. Any unity worthy of the name must be sought in the framework of the whole truth, in other words, in complete fidelity to Revelation.

This has been fully grasped by the Orthodox theologians, George Florovsky and Basil Ioannidis who, according to *Le Monde* of August 28, "have formulated some perfectly clear statements: Tradition as well as the Bible is the source of the Church's authority: in any project of reunion the first nine centuries of Christianity cannot be simply left out of account, nor can one forget the ecumenical councils nor the writings of the Fathers; the institution of the Episcopacy belongs to the very essence of the Church; any reunion which dismisses from its

consideration the Roman Catholic Church would only be ephemeral."

Other commentators, such as the editor of *La Suisse* (September 10), continue to insist on the necessity of all Christians working together for the amelioration of temporal conditions:

"The presence of the Church in the world—this is the significance of the Evanston Assembly. This is what the conference wishes to impress on the consciousness of all the Churches by inviting them to no longer be anxious about their security but to seize hold of the solidarity which binds them to an unsettled world. We intentionally say 'the Churches', and not only the clergy; for it is the fidelity of each person, man or woman, in all departments of life which will, far more than the work of the clergy, show forth the virtue of hope, the foundation of which is Christ Himself."

But how much more effective would be this action if Christians were not divided among themselves! Let us ponder over the pressing duty of spreading the Gospel! But what can a divided Christianity do except bring its own divisions to the peoples it addresses?

However, let us end this review with a consoling thought. We must confess that the message of Evanston was an agreeable surprise for us. We did not expect anything so positive. For, on the three principal points where there was disagreement among the members of the World Council, the best doctrine prevailed. The basic tenet of the Council, faith in the divinity of Christ, was openly professed: "Jesus Christ stood with us. He came to us true God and true man, to seek and to save. Though we were the enemies of God, He died for us . . ."; the end of man—to find God and to save his soul—was strongly reaffirmed; a touching appeal for unity in faith was clearly addressed to the (different) communities: "Is your Church seriously considering its relation to other Churches in the light of Our Lord's prayer that we may be sanctified in the truth and that we may all be one?"

The idea of unity, once it has penetrated the hearts of our separated brethren, will be, through the grace of the Holy Spirit, the most efficacious force for the attainment of unity.

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

THE MISSION OF THE CHAIR OF UNITY OCTAVE

In recent years there has been a growing restlessness running throughout Christendom. Great numbers of separated Christians are discontented with the inherited disorder of sectarianism. Many, who are deeply devoted to the Person of Christ, are pained at the realisation that they are in a condition which is completely at variance with His explicit designs. They have launched an enterprise which envisions nothing less than the religious unification of the whole world. The meeting of the World Council at Evanston was a visible manifestation of their sober concern and serious intent.

We have no hesitation in ascribing this general desire for unity, according to the mind of Christ, to Divine Providence itself. Indeed, the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office regarded it as due to the grace of God and the prayers of the faihful (*Instructio*, 20 December, 1949). Now, it is a fact of history that the formal beginnings (Edinburgh, 1910) of what is called the Ecumenical Movement followed two years after the launching of another movement called the *Chair of Unity Octave* (Graymoor, N.Y., 1908). While not causally connected, we like to think of them as providentially related. The spread of the Octave throughout the world has been accompanied by the growing momentum of the Ecumenical Movement. We note with satisfaction that the World Council has adopted the practise of the Faith and Order group by assigning this period (January 18-25) as a special time for prayer for unity by all its members.

As conceived by its originator, the Very Rev. Paul James Francis Wattson, S.A., and as propagated by the Society of the Atonement which he founded, the Octave has a concrete mission. This mission is integral with the Octave itself and is clearly expressed in those daily intentions which enjoy the approval of the Holy See. (They are appended to this article).

It is often useful to reflect upon the nature of the work in which one is engaged. Involved amid details and subsidiary questions, it might happen that one can lose the perspective of the whole. A personal sympathy here, a psychological difficulty there, an historical problem or doctrinal question—these absorb much attention and interest and deservedly so. But one must not lose sight of the final object towards which every other function must converge. The time of the Octave provides an opportunity for Catholic apostles to renew the clarity of vision with respect to their fundamental mission.

We speak of the apostolate of unity. What, precisely, do we mean? There are three possible answers to that question The first notion that comes to mind is to *constitute* a unity out of scattered parts. This must be absolutely rejected, for we are not laboring for the unity of the Church itself. The Catholic Church already enjoys divinely-given and divinely-sustained unity. Moreover, in this respect, it is utterly

indefectible in virtue of divine promises which will never become void either by reason of external opposition or human frailty. The mission of the Octave does not operate from a premise of a "divided church" but rather from the actual existence of a visible and divinely given unity, which, in point of fact, is one of the most noteworthy characteristics of the Catholic Church.

The second sense in which we may understand the apostolate of unity is the intensification of the internal bonds of unity which are Faith, Hope, and Charity. It is in this sense that the prayers of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass are to be understood when they speak of "unifying" the Church. The greater the faith, hope, and charity there is, the more perfect this unity will be. This perfectibility, however, refers not to the divine life of the Church as such, but rather to its participation and exercise by the faithful. Hence, any practise which looks to the perfection of the faithful promotes the unity of the Church in this sense. The Octave is a form of prayer prompted by charity; hence it benefits the one who prays and thereby overflows to the benefit of the Church. It shares this effect with all other forms of prayer and devotion, but does not form the distinctive object of its petition *per se*.

Finally, we may understand the apostolate of unity in an *extensive* sense, namely, that the unity of the Church should eventually include others who do not presently share in it. This may be seen in the words of Our Lord: "Other sheep I have that are not of this fold . . . and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." Or, at His last supper, when He prayed: ". . . Nor for these only do I pray, but for those also who through their word are to believe in me, that all may be one . . ." In other words, this is the continuation of His work of reconciliation, the progressive application to the souls of men of the fruits of the Redemption which will involve their membership in the Mystical Body, which is the Catholic Church. Working out from a divinely-given visible unity, the apostolate of unity seeks ever to enlarge its bounds until it encompasses the earth. Such is the divine mission of the Catholic Church; such also is the foundation for the work of the Chair of Unity Octave.

The Octave, moreover, specifies the precise nature of the unity into which it aims to incorporate men. It opens with the feast of the Chair of St. Peter at Rome (Jan. 18) and closes with the feast of the Conversion of St. Paul (Jan. 25). It aims to bring all men into that unity of faith and government which derives its effective direction from the Apostolic See; it looks to the conversion and membership of all men into this numerically one visible society founded by Christ and spread all over the world.

We do recognize, of course, that our separated brethren behold the question of unity in a different context. They regard the present condition of Christendom as a result of division *of* the Church itself rather than separation *from* the Church, which it actually is. This is under-

standable, for they are one with the problem itself. When they pray during the Octave, their intention lacks specification apart from the general yearning for a unity pleasing to God. We trust that God will have regard to their sincerity and fervor and grant a happy issue to their desires. In the past He blessed the efforts of the praying Cornelius (Acts X) by admonishing him to get in touch with one Simon Peter; in due time we hope that God will enlighten them with the same directive.

On the other hand, when Catholics pray during the Octave, they do not abstract from the concrete reality of the divine mission given to the Church. It is this very fact that enkindles their zeal and assures them of fruitful results. They know, precisely, what they are praying for, namely, to share the priceless treasures of Divine Faith with those who do not have them.

It is, then, the mission of the Chair of Unity Octave to hasten through prayer the accomplishment of the divine mission of the Catholic Church to make disciples of all nations. But it is also part of its object to propagate the knowledge of the divinely established constitution of the Church. It is in this latter respect that it makes a solid contribution to the ecumenical quest. Our separated brethren admit candidly that they are in search of the divine solution to disunity and, in consequence, search out each other's resources and speculations. Surely, historical Christianity i.e. the Church of which Peter is the visible head, merits their prayerful consideration. At the present moment this is not acceptable to them, but not to all in the same degree; prejudice is yielding place to respect and, in God's own time, the distance will be shortened and isolation will give way to love. We must, however, continue to keep before their minds the image of God's design for unity and especially the maternal love which the Catholic Church has for all of them whom she regards as her estranged children. In some respect we are in a position analogous to that of St. Paul as he stood in a public square of Athens looking at an altar dedicated to the "unknown god". With him we turn to our separated brethren and paraphrase his words: "What, therefore, you seek unknowingly, that we preach to you".

Let us keep close to the spirit of Fr. Paul Wattson, S.A. who founded the Octave. A few years before his death, he reiterated before a vast radio audience the divine truth to whose propagation he had devoted his life: "There is no other unity possible in the divine economy save that which is built upon the same foundation as the one on which Christ Jesus, the Lord and Master, founded His Church, and you know what that foundation is ... When, therefore, you unite with us in the observance of the Unity Octave, it should be to pray specifically that all those who, down through the centuries, have been separated from the Chair of Peter at Rome may return to Catholic communion, that is to say, communion with the Apostolic See".

THE INTENTIONS OF THE CHAIR OF UNITY OCTAVE

January 18 - *The Return of the Other Sheep to the One Fold*
January 19 - *The Return of the Oriental Separatists*
January 20 - *The Return of Anglicans to the Authority of the Vicar of Christ*
January 21 - *That the Lutherans and Other Protestants of Europe May Return to the One Fold*
January 22 - *That Christians in America May Become One in Communion with the See of St. Peter*
January 23 - *The Return of Lapsed Catholics to the Sacraments*
January 24 - *The Conversion of the Jews*
January 25 - *The Missionary Conquest of the World for Christ*

Prayer of the Octave

O Lord Jesus Christ, who didst say to thine Apostles, Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you, regard not our sins but the faith of thy Church, and grant unto her that peace and unity which are agreeable to thy will, who livest and reignest world without end. Amen.

EDWARD F. HANAHOE, S.A.

REFLECTIONS ON "THE CONVERSION OF ENGLAND"

During the course of the months of May to September of this year in the English Catholic weekly, *The Tablet*, there has been a long correspondence on the subject of the conversion of England. Though an occasional letter widened the issue to take in members of the Free Churches and those who, belonging to no particular Church, have no or next to no religion at all, most of the writers were thinking in terms of Anglicans, and it will be convenient here to follow their lead; for in point of fact, the reference to non-Anglican Protestants added little definite to the correspondence.

The Rev. Bruno Scott James, himself a convert from Anglicanism, started the ball rolling in the issue of 29th May. His letter developed two main points--that the post-Tridentine devotional atmosphere of Catholic churches in England is uncongenial and unattractive to non-Catholic Englishmen (and he goes on to speak of Anglicanism); and that the relations of foreign Catholic clergy, chiefly French and Belgian, with Anglicans is an obstacle to the conversion of England. Both of these points were taken up, commented on, and expanded in the subsequent correspondence.

It is not my purpose here to repeat the long series of letters, but only to record some of my reflections on it, quoting from the letters from time to time when convenient. Those who desire to read the contributions can find the originals in the *Tablet* (29th May to 4th September), or a generous selection of excerpts in *La Documentation Catholique* no. 1185 of 31st October, 1954. It will perhaps make for clarity if the two main points of the original letter are preserved and treated separately.

When the correspondents write of the spiritual atmosphere of modern Catholics, they are almost exclusively referring to the services that take place usually in the evenings of Sundays and some weekdays--devotions to the Blessed Sacrament, to the Sacred Heart, to Our Lady. These are contrasted with the austerity and dignity of the Anglican evensong, as a rule in favour of the latter, which it is suggested, is more medieval and, by implication, more Anglo-Saxon. The conclusion that might be drawn is that by the Reformation the Catholic Church in England lost. No doubt in some respect this is true, at least in the sense that, had there been no Reformation in England, the Catholic Church in England would not be exactly the same as it is now, though how different one cannot even guess. Assuredly it would not have stood outside of the great continental Catholic tradition any more after 1534 than it did before, and it would have shared in all the developments of the devotional and spiritual life that have characterized the Church at large. It would have continued its pilgrimages to the shrines of Our Lady and of saints like St. Thomas à Becket: it would have gone *pari passu* with the Churches of Rome, of France, of Germany in its love of Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament: it would certainly not have re-

mained unaffected by the devotion to the Sacred Heart that Bl. Claude de la Colombière preached in London at the court of Charles I's queen. The differences between the Catholic Church and the Anglican Church, then, in spiritual atmosphere betokens to the Catholic Church not a loss but a gain, even if every manifestation of every devotion does not suit everyone; to the Anglican Church a serious loss, in that its spiritual and devotional life, separated from the living Church of Christ, stood still.

If now we leave the periphery and come to the centre of Catholic practice, the Reformation was a tragedy for Anglicanism, because it lost for it the Mass. I know that this statement will not be acceptable to some Anglicans for whom now the sacramental system is the backbone both of their ecclesiological theology and their Christian practice. But that system is the matured result of the Oxford Movement in Anglicanism, which they did not find in their Church of the XVIII century, nor even in the Caroline Divines (1) (they laboured to justify it from the Caroline Divines): they found it in the Catholic Church, and thence they introduced it in the face of much opposition into their own. None of those converts who have an occasional feeling of nostalgia for the chant of evensong would, I think, desire to see the XVIII century Mattins, with the Holy Communion as a monthly 'second service', replace the Catholic Mass. Whether they regret at times the Anglican Choral Eucharist I don't know. None of the letters speaks of this point at all: they are all concerned with the less important elements of Catholic devotion.

Yet even these cannot be quite so alien to the English spirit as some of the writers make out. As notes Sir Henry Slesser (*Tablet* 5th June), himself a convert from Anglicanism and thoroughly acquainted with High Anglican ways—for he was till comparatively recently Chairman of the Church Union executive committee—Anglo-Catholics have taken up all the practices dubbed post-Tridentine. They have their shrines of Our Lady at Walsingham and organize pilgrimages to it; their churches have Stations of the Cross, statues, reservation. I myself went into an Anglican church in Oxford on the afternoon of the first Friday of August 1953 and found 'exposition of the Blessed Sacrament' in progress with flowers, candles, watchers before the altar—all as one might find in any Catholic church. Once again this is something not native to Anglicanism, but it is native to Catholicism; and it is intelligible, one might almost say inevitable, that once the doctrine of the Real Presence and of the Sacrifice of the Mass had been taken over from the Catholic Church these practices should flow from them as a natural development, given the Western background of their tradition. Like us, the Anglo-Catholics of today have a theology that accepts the sacramental system, devotion to Our Lady and the saints, prayers for

(1) The Caroline Divines were the Anglican writers of the XVII century who opposed both Puritans and Catholics.

the dead, and the rest. So these devotional practices have a meaning for them that they do not have for more evangelical Protestants.

That, I think, is the key to the problem of why it is said that our churches appear 'un-English' to a Protestant visitor at Catholic services (e.g. *Tablet*, 19th June), because the Protestant visitor does not understand what it is all about. He might be impressed by the chant and the ceremony of a High Mass, say, in Westminster Cathedral, but he would be just as much at sea over its meaning as he would be at a procession of the Blessed Sacrament. For devotion is not divorced from doctrine. It is the practical application of doctrine, and some knowledge of the doctrinal basis is essential if a casual visitor is going to be edified. And if he is an ardent Protestant, brought up to reject the doctrine of the Real Presence and devotion to Our Lady as idolatry, he may even be scandalised, although the reverence of the priest at the altar and the absorption of the congregation in the service may not be without effect on him; and, if the church is crammed as it so often is at Sunday Mass, he may in his mind contrast the attendance of Catholics at their churches with the more meagre observance in his own. That may make him think, and thinking may lead him to enquire and finally to learn the doctrines that render the practices intelligible.

This point of the fundamental position of doctrine was emphasised by an Anglican clergyman, the Rev. N.E. Wallbank (*Tablet*, 26th June), not in reference only to certain Catholic devotions, but much more generally. As examples he mentions the doctrine of merit, the basis of the practice of indulgences, and the 'doctrine of authority distinctive of the Roman Church', with papal infallibility as its latest developed dogma, as the real source of disagreement between Anglicans and Catholics. And of course he is right. The great point of difference between Catholics and Protestants in general lies in the question of authority. Sir Henry Slesser earlier in the correspondence and referring to the High Church had already said as much: "The reason, fundamentally, of their refusal to submit to the Church or be received into it was in many cases a very human dislike of authority, shown most clearly in their refusal often to accept the rulings of their own more Protestant bishops" (*Tablet*, 5th June).

The Reformation rejected the jurisdiction of the Pope (and in this at least the Anglican Church was a faithful upholder of Reformation theology) and held the Bible as the sole authority in matters of faith. The theology of the XIX century undermined the guidance that till then Protestants had drawn from Holy Scripture. Anglicans claim that they have a triple fount of the faith—Scripture, Tradition, and sound learning. Of these in practice it is the third that is paramount, for by it they interpret the other two. The result is the various 'schools of thought' that characterize Anglicanism, each claiming to represent the true tradition of its own Church and to perpetuate more perfectly the faith of the primitive Church. The various Nonconformist bodies

claim as much and on the same basis. Where, then, is the truth? On the principles of Protestantism it is unattainable at least with certainty of knowledge, and indeed not a few Protestants admit as much at least for many, if not most, points of doctrine, saying that we should be content with three or four fundamental affirmations and leave the rest undefined. "But our Lord never promised infallibility to His Church ... Nor is it possible to accept the Bible as an infallible guide" (1): yet without an infallible authority to control and direct there can be no unity of faith, no 'One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church'. So long as a man rejects the principle of authority in the Church, an infallible authority which centres on the Bishop of Rome, he is indeed far from the Catholic Church, for she always has and still does believe in it wholeheartedly.

The same correspondent, at the end of his letter, refers to the continental clergy and gives the reasons "why the Anglican feels more at home with French or Belgian clergy than among English Roman Catholics" as: "In the first place, the French and Belgians, without any abandonment of their theological principles, have often taken the trouble to acquire a real understanding of the Anglican position, and do not misrepresent it, at any rate upon questions of fact. Secondly, the French clergy regard me as a priest (if rather an irregular one), whereas their English brethren regard me as an impostor, even when they are too polite to say so!" Fr. Pilkington, replying in the *Tablet* of 3rd July, suggested that the French clergy regarded the Rev. Mr. Wallbank as an Anglican priest, not as the equal of a Catholic priest. It is sincerely to be hoped so, but one has heard so many stories of the action of some of the French clergy that one wonders if that is so. An article in the *Tablet* of 17th July from an ex-Anglican who was led into the Church by what he had seen of it in France and Belgium states: "It has now been publicly admitted that Anglicans have been allowed to celebrate on Catholic altars in France, with the idea that it would further unity"—and in such instances and in cases of allowing Anglicans to communicate from Catholic altars, the initiative is not always from the Anglican side. The same article mentions an Anglican refusing to receive Holy Communion which a Catholic priest urged on him, knowing him to be an Anglican, and I myself know of a similar instance.

Leaving aside reflections on the lack of discipline that such actions manifest, on the disloyalty to the authority of the Church which has formally declared Anglican Orders to be invalid and on the lack of charity that they show to the English Catholic hierarchy and English Catholics in general who accept the decision of the Holy See and frame their conduct accordingly, I would instead suggest that by behaving in that way the French clergy, far from promoting unity between Anglicanism and Catholicism, are impeding it. Anglicans are so habituated to the divisions within their own Church, to the refusal to obey their

(1) C. GARBETT (Archbishop of York): *The Claims of the Church of England* (London, 1947) p. 38.

bishops (as in the Ritualistic controversy of the end of the last century and the beginning of this) who, because they were without the means of coercion and indeed of a clear idea of what they would have coerced to, ended by tolerating the lack of discipline, that they readily accept a similar state of things in other Churches. Though they know theoretically that among Catholics there is a single faith and a single discipline, they tend in practice to take that as only a façade behind which there reigns nearly as much division as is in their own body. A large party within the Catholic Church accepts their Orders, they will think, so why should they have any doubt about them themselves. Sit tight and wait. In the fulness of time (Rome moves slowly) the Catholic Church will change, and they can then join it on their own conditions.

The reasons that the Rev. Mr. Wallbank gives why he finds relations with the continental clergy easier than with English Catholics are very intelligible—they accept him for what he thinks he is. But how much do they really know about him or the past history of his Church, with or without 'misrepresentations' the nature of which he does not specify? Had they studied his letter to the *Tablet* and realised that he roundly denies any doctrine of merit, of infallibility in the Church as well as the more recent definitions of Our Lady's Immaculate Conception and Assumption — and doubtless other things besides — would they then so readily acclaim him as a Catholic priest? The Catholics of England do know something of the religious history of their country over the last four centuries, and they cannot help but view him in the light of it. They do not as he says, regard him as an 'impostor', if that is taken as implying conscious deceit, but they do not believe that he is a Catholic priest, even if he thinks he is one himself. They have, too, another difficulty that perhaps the French have not, for presumably our continental brethren come into close contact only with High Churchmen. Until an Anglican minister declares his views in some way, they do not even know whether he wants to be considered as a Catholic priest or not, for among the Anglican clergy there are as many who repudiate all notion of Real objective Presence and of Sacrifice in their Holy Communion service as there are those who hold these doctrines. The same ordination rite of the Church of England produces, besides Anglo-Catholics, ministers who declare that they have thereby received no more power than what Nonconformists gain from ordination and who, holding naturally that the Anglican rite confers valid Orders, yet willingly agree with *Apostolicae curae* that it does not make sacrificing priests and was of set purpose never meant to. (1) So there is something to be said for the hesitant attitude of

(1) "We conclude therefore that there is nothing in the Church of England standards to suggest that the Anglican ministry is 'priestly' in any sense which would make it different from the Free Church ministry of the Word and Sacraments": *The Scheme of Church Union in South India* — (A Statement issued by 23 Evangelicals of the Church of England and addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury: Church Book Room, London).

English Catholics towards their Anglican brethren, and to account for their bewilderment at the varieties they observe within the Anglican Church, as when (as I have been told) a Catholic parish priest who had laboured hard to organize some celebrations in his church to signalize the Marian year heard that his Anglican vis-à-vis was outdoing him by arranging a pilgrimage of his Anglican parishioners to Rome.

The position, it must be admitted, of a High Church minister who believes that he is a Catholic priest is indeed a difficult one. Persuaded absolutely himself that his ordination has conferred on him all the powers that the Catholic rite gives to the Catholic priest, he finds his dearest convictions repudiated by many of his own brethren and denied by the Church of Rome. He will admit that the changes from the ancient ceremonial introduced into the Prayer Book by Cranmer and the Edwardian bishops had an heretical intent, but not that they were such as to render it insufficient for valid use. All that was done before 1553, he holds, was imposed on his Church from above; the Church had no part in it and did not accept it. As soon as it could speak—under Elizabeth—it did speak and with no uncertain voice (1). It declared its mind, it is said, in the XXXIX Articles; yet when Newman tried in the famous Tract 90 to prove that these were all compatible with Catholic teaching he raised such a storm of indignation that he barely escaped public execration.

Even so, what holds many an Anglican minister in the Anglican Church and prevents his joining the Catholic Church is just that firm conviction about the validity of his ordination and the consequent spiritual efficacy of the 'Masses' he celebrates and the sacraments he ministers. In conversation or with the pen, to support his claim, he will adduce arguments like the one indicated above and others from the doctrine of intention and from the comparison of 'forms' of ordination: and he is persuaded of the cogency of his reasons. But it seems to me that the real, final and fundamental ground of his conviction lies not in reasons of that sort, but in his experience. "Meanwhile unless all is make-believe, the dear God produces amongst His Anglican children the fruits and flowers of the Catholic life, any number of unbeatified saints, Religious of undoubted holiness, and withal the kind of suffering which makes us cry out from beneath the altar: 'How long, O Lord, how long'" (Letter of the Rev. Desmond Morse-Boycott in the *Tablet* of 24th July). He experiences in his own private life the consolations of religion that accompany his sacramental acts and give him strength and perseverance to work for souls. He sees others to whom he ministers encouraged to pursue the Christian life. And he concludes —'Digitus Dei est hic: the Holy Spirit thus confirms my faith and endorses my convictions. Though my soul yearns to go to Rome and leave this terra aliena where I am, yet Rome denies to me what I hold to be

(1) E. g. of. G. DIX: *The Question of Anglican Orders* (London 1944) pp. 33-34.

true, and it would be a rejection of the Spirit and acting a lie to go to Rome on that condition'.

One cannot but have a deep sympathy with a man caught by such a dilemma, and if I now venture to offer a few reflections on this matter, I do it with every endeavour not to hurt the feelings of any such as may read them. No Catholic would assert that only within the bounds of his own Church is the Holy Spirit active in the souls of men. On the contrary he believes that grace is given to all men of good will wherever they may be and in proportion to their good will. So he would not deny that the Holy Spirit may and does bless abundantly the self-sacrifice and devotion to pastoral duty of many an Anglican minister. The Anglican Church made a similar profession in respect of Free Church Orders: the Appeal to All Christian People of Lambeth 1920 declares: "We thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace". That statement was approved by Anglo-Catholic bishops like the late Bishop Weston. It would not be denied by Anglo-Roman ministers of today. But neither the ones nor the others would take it as an assertion and a proof that Nonconformist Orders are the same as their own.

Is it then to be said that such action of the Spirit of God has no evidential value? By no means. That would be to deny the whole history of Catholic mysticism. But the true mystics were always submissive to the Church. St. Theresa of Avila obeyed her confessor, Fr. Gracian, on one occasion even though he went against a revelation she thought she had received, because, as she said, she could never go wrong by being obedient, whereas she could by trusting to her own judgement in such things. Anglo-Romans do not consider that the Bull *Apostolicae curae* was an infallible pronouncement. But the Spirit that Christ Our Lord bequeathed to His Church is not confined in His action only to infallible definitions. They think that the rejection of their Orders was brought about by the opposition and intrigues of the English Catholic hierarchy and that Pope Leo XIII weakly yielded. Even if that were true, it would still not fetter the action of the Holy Spirit within the Church. They profess to accept the primacy of Peter, the infallibility of the Holy See and the whole Catholic doctrine of authority. Would it then not be wiser and more consonant with their professed views to submit their wills, even if with regret, to the voice of authority that has spoken about their Orders? There is no doubt as to what a St. Theresa would do, if we can imagine her in their position, and she had clearer revelations of God's will than they have.

It looks as if a new and more strained period of tension lies ahead for the Anglican Church. There is within it a strong movement for union of some sort with one or other of the Nonconformist bodies. The question, too, of the Church of South India comes up for decision again within the next few months, and the party favourable to a recognition

of South Indian Orders has apparently steadily gathered strength in the last five years. High Churchmen are utterly opposed to any concession on either of these issues. But if the decision goes against their views, what then? At the least they will be in an intensely difficult, if not impossible, position. For the Catholic those are domestic questions within the Anglican body in which he cannot interfere. But because he knows that any compromise in doctrine—and concession on either of those questions will involve compromise—is a weakening of religion, his sympathy instinctively goes with the High Churchmen who are striving for its defence. Anglicans should believe that, not only in Belgium and France, but also in England there are Catholics who are concerned about the destiny of their Church, who follow with interest their endeavours to bring unity among Christians even though they think them sadly misdirected, and who pray that they may be ultimately guided to the sole seat of unity, the Catholic Church of Rome.

J. GILL, S.J.

CARDINAL NEWMAN'S PRAYER FOR UNITY

O Lord Jesus Christ, who when Thou wast about to suffer didst pray for Thy disciples to the end of time that they might all be one, as Thou art in the Father and the Father in Thee, look down in pity on the mainfold divisions among those who profess Thy faith and heal the many wounds which the pride of man and the craft of Satan have inflicted on Thy people.

Break down the walls of separation which divide one party and denomination of Christians from another. Look with compassion on the souls who have been born in one or other of these communions, which not Thou, but man, hath made.

Set free the prisoners from these unauthorised forms of worship, and bring them all to the one communion which Thou didst set up at the beginning—the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

Teach all men that the See of Peter, the Holy Church of Rome is the foundation, centre and instrument of Unity. Open their hearts to the long forgotten truth that the Holy Father, the Pope, is Thy Vicar and Representative; and that in obeying him in matters of religion they are obeying Thee, so that as there is but one company in heaven above, so likewise there may be one communion, confessing and glorifying Thy holy Name, here below.

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

NOTE: *The following tract was written some years ago by Adrian Fortescue and is reproduced here with the kind permission of the Catholic Truth Society of London. The document discussed is of considerable historical interest and has a practical bearing on the contemporary issues relating to the reunion of Christendom. The most noteworthy feature which impresses us is the constant and unvarying basic policy of the Catholic Church with respect to the reconciliation of those who dissent from her faith and communion. Abstracting from personalities and historical contingencies, one will find the "formula' of Pope St. Hormisdas of the 6th century re-echoed in the* Satis cognitum *of Pope Leo XIII in the 19th and* Mortalium animos *of Pope Pius XI in the 20th century (to take two examples). We should point out, however, that today we deal with dissidents who are not such by their deliberate choice, but rather by inheritance deepened by centuries of isolation and misunderstanding. We hope that, under the movement of divine grace, their present restlessness with division will issue in the recognition that, apart from communion with the Holy See, they will not attain true Christian unity.*

EDWARD F. HANAHOE, S.A.

THE REUNION FORMULA OF HORMISDAS

The Formula used at the time of Pope Hormisdas, as the basis of reconciliation with Rome after the Acacian schism, is one of the most important and best known witnesses of the Papacy in early Church history. It owes its importance to its date (515), to the exceedingly clear statements it contains, and perhaps most of all to the great number of bishops in East and West who signed it. It supplies the plainest proof that the Church of the first six centuries believed in the primacy and infallibility of the Pope, and in the necessity of being in communion with him.

1. *The Henotikon of Zeno*

Throughout the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries the Monophysites were a very serious danger to the Empire. The Council of Chalcedon in 451, which condemned this heresy, marks not so much the end as rather the beginning of its history. Chalcedon became the test of the Catholic faith. After the council it was no longer necessary to go into the metaphysical question of nature and person in Christ in detail; acceptance of what had been defined at Chalcedon supplied an obvious test of orthodoxy. But there remained large and powerful bodies of Monophysites who stood by the equally simple test of rejection of Chalcedon. So the council, though it by no means put an end to the heresy, did at least supply a clear standard by which everyone could be judged. A man who accepted Chalcedon was a Catholic (1); a man who rejected it was a Monophysite.

(1) Namely, as far as this question is concerned. Obviously it is possible to accept Chalcedon and yet hold heresy on some other point.

The Monophysites were specially powerful, and specially dangerous, in Egypt and Syria. In Egypt practically the whole native population was Monophysite. The Egyptians took up this cause, thinking it to be that of their national hero, St. Cyril of Alexandria; in the Council of Chalcedon they saw nothing but a return to the Nestorian heresy which he had fought, a denial of that of Ephesus were he had triumphed. So Monophysism formed the national (Coptic) Church of Egypt; only a small body of Greek officials and soldiers were "Melkites" (2) holding to the Emperor's religion and Chalcedon. In Syria the Monophysites never absorbed the whole native population, as they did in Egypt. The population of Syria was much less united in every way; also Syria was nearer to the capital. But in Syria too the Monophysites became a powerful party, eventually forming the Jacobite Church. These two provinces were the richest and most populous of the Empire. Undoubtedly there was a good deal of national, anti-imperialist feeling behind their defence of a heresy condemned by the Church of the Empire and by the government. There was also treason mixed up with their Monophysism. In the year 457 the Egyptians murdered the orthodox Patriarch, Proterius, whom the government had forced upon them; then they shut up the soldiers of the garrison in an old temple and burned them alive. In Syria too rebellion against the Empire and the murder of Imperial functionaries accompanied the heresy. How real the danger to the Empire was from Monophysism is proved by the ease with which in the seventh century just these two provinces were conquered by the Moslems, they being rather helped than hindered by the heretical natives. These, after centuries of persecution by the Roman government at Constantinople, after unceasing strife against the Emperor, welcomed the conquerors who promised toleration to their kind of Christianity.

So from the time of Chalcedon to the Moslem conquest of Egypt and Syria, the Roman government was enormously concerned about the Monophysite danger. To modern people an obvious solution of the difficulty would suggest itself; namely, to make fair laws for all, to tolerate all religions, and to have loyal subjects of different creeds. But this idea occurred to none of them. It was a recognized axiom that Church and State must march together. Political unity was supposed to be impossible without religious unity; the subjects of a government must share its faith. So heresy is always rebellion. It should be remembered that this view was accepted on all sides. The Monophysites no more asked for more religious toleration than the government was prepared to give it to them. Both sides, Catholics and Monophysite, worked for the same aim, to capture the whole position in Church and State, and to crush their rivals altogether. The ideal of separate communities living peaceably side by side, while obeying the same laws, occurred to no one. When we say that heresy was rebellion, that axiom

(2) "Imperialists".

suggests to us intolerance and persecution on the part of the government; but we must remember that the heretics too accepted it and always acted on it. Several times a usurper attacks the reigning Emperor, marches against him with an army, on the avowed plea that Monophysism has come to fight Chalcedonianism. The two ideals, religious and political, become so interwoven that it is generally impossible to say whether heresy causes rebellion or rebellion heresy.

The government then, fearing Monophysism, alternated between two policies with regard to it. At times it tried to extinguish the heresy by persecution; at times, despairing of this, it tried to reconcile the Monophysites to Caesar's Church by a compromise. They would have been reconciled at once if Caesar had turned Monophysite. There are a few cases of frankly Monophysite Emperors, or anti-Emperors. But, although the heretics were so powerful in Egypt and Syria, in the whole Empire the Catholics were very much more numerous. So an openly Monophysite Emperor had very little chance. Hence the numerous attempts to find some formula which both parties could accept, so as to end the disastrous schism. None of these attempts were ever successful, for an obvious reason. There was no ground on which the parties could really meet. All thorough Monophysites would be content with nothing less than a formal rejection of Chalcedon; no Catholic could tolerate this. So these compromises never succeeded in their object. They generally proceed on the basis of saying nothing about Chalcedon at all. This does not satisfy the Monophysites, and it always causes friction with the Catholics. The result of all such attempts was, not to reconcile the heretics, but to alienate the West and Rome.

In 474 Zeno became Emperor. He was a barbarian from Isauria, formerly an officer in the guard. His original name was Tarasikodissa. He had married Ariadne, the daughter of Leo I (450-457). His son, Leo II (474), first succeeded Leo I. Leo II had Tarasikodissa crowned as fellow-Emperor; then Leo II died, and Tarasikodissa, having taken the Greek name Zeno, became sole Emperor. He was very unpopular. Soon after his accession, the widow of Leo I, Verina, raised a tumult against him and caused her brother, Basiliskos, to be crowned (476). Basiliskos was one of the Emperors who threw in their lot openly with the Monophysites. The two leaders of that party were then Timothy the Cat (Timotheus Aelurus), Monophysite claimant of the see of Alexandria, and Peter the Fuller (Fullo) at Antioch. Basiliskos at once set up these two in those sees, drove out and persecuted Catholic bishops, and published an edict denouncing Chalcedon. Acacius (471-489), Patriarch of Constantinople, was about to conform to Basiliskos's law, when he found popular feeling in the capital too strong, and drew back. Basiliskos then tried to modify his law; but soon after a counter-revolution drove him to exile and restored Zeno (477). Zeno returned as the Catholic candidate. It was chiefly Basiliskos's Monophysism which had led to his fall. At first Zeno made a great point of his Catholic principles. He restored the Catholic bishops, drove out Peter the Fuller from

Antioch, and sent the Pope (Simplicius, 463-483) an unimpeachable profession of his faith, assuring him that he would not allow Chalcedon to be tampered with and that he would put down Monophysism. Timothy Salophakiolos became Patriarch of Alexandria.

The Monophysites set up Peter Mongos, formerly deacon of Timothy the Cat, as rival to Salophakiolos. Mongos now becomes the chief leader of that party, so that communion with him is the outer sign of Monophysism. Acacius of Constantinople at first showed himself zealous against the heretics. The Pope wrote to ask him to expel them from the sees they still held throughout the East (3). When Salophakiolos died in 481, the Monophysites of Egypt claimed the see for Mongos, while the Melkites made John Talaia Patriarch. It was unfortunate for Talaia that he incurred the enmity of Acacius (4). Mongos came to Constantinople, persuaded the Emperor and Acacius that Talaia was very unpopular in Egypt (5), and discussed the possibility of drawing up a formula which both Chalcedonians and Monophysites could accept. Zeno did not dare declare himself a Monophysite; but it seemed that, if such a form could be composed, Mongos would sign it, and so go back to Alexandria as Patriarch, while the Chalcedonians of Constantinople would not be able to say that their religion had been attacked. Acacius, already the enemy of Talaia, fell in with the plan. He and Mongos persuaded Zeno to put forth a formula which they had composed. This formula is the Henotikon (unification). It is meant to reconcile all parties, and so to pave the way for Mongos's return to Alexandria. Zeno published his Henotikon in 482. It proposes as the faith, first the Nicene Creed, with the additions made at Constantinople in 381. Nestorius and Eutyches (6) are both condemned. Christ is "one, not two", but nothing further is to be said than that. In particular the expression "two natures" is avoided. It is declared that all theories differing from this, whether proclaimed at Chalcedon or anywhere else, are anathema (7).

This edict, composed at first for the special case of Alexandria, was then imposed on all bishops, as far as authority of the Emperor could reach them.

2. *The Acacian Schism*

The Henotikon, which was to unite Catholics and Monophysites, really made four parties instead of two. Catholics who had the courage of their convictions rejected it altogether. It was no good to propose to them a formula which evaded the decision of Chalcedon; their posi-

(3) Simplicius, ep. 18, ad Acacium, in Thiel: *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum genuinae* (Brunsbergae, 1867-1868), pp. 208-212.

(4) It appears that he hurt Acacius's feelings by delaying to send him notice of his own appointment. Evagrius, Eccl. Hist., iii 12 (Migne, Patr. Gr. lxxxvi. 2617-2620).

(5) This was no doubt true, Egypt was Monophysite.

(6) Monophysites were always willing to condemn Eutyches. See *The Lesser Eastern Churches* (C.T.S., 1913) pp. 168-169, 186, 342, 411.

(7) The text of the Henotikon is given in Greek by Evagrius, *Eccl. Hist.* iii. 14 (Migne, Pat. Gr., lxxxvi, 2620-2625); in Latin by Liberatus: *Brev. caus. Nest. et Eutych,* 17 (Patr. Lat., lxviii 1023-1024).

tion was that Chalcedon had defined the Catholic faith; they could be content with nothing less than its full explicit acceptance. Moreover, the Henotikon did more than evade Chalcedon; practically it rejected it. For more than what the Henotikon said had been defined by the council, and the Henotikon cursed all who had done so. The purposely injurious reference to Chalcedon (put in to please the Monophysites) alone was sufficient reason why a Catholic must refuse to sign it. Nor were the thorough Monophysites satisfied. They demanded as explicit rejection of belief in two natures in our Lord. The Henotikon, compromising on the other side too, carefully avoided this. So there remained a large party of Monophysites who detested it from their point of view, as much as did Catholics. But even among those who accepted the Henotikon there remained two parties. Some accepted it in a Catholic sense, as far as they could, others in a Monophysite sense. It did not succeed in producing union even between these; whereas each set of those who signed was put out of communion by its more logical coreligionists who refused to do so. Thus there were now four parties: Catholics, Monophysites, Catholic-minded signers of the Henotikon, Monophysite-minded signers. Each of those parties was in schism with all the others.

The West was solidly Catholic. The Emperor could not make the Western bishops sign, because he had no longer any power in the West. All the West with the Pope was uncompromisingly opposed to the new formula. But in the East too, all through this trouble, were many who would have nothing to do with the Henotikon. Such bishops were exiled and persecuted. But we must remember during the schism that followed there were many throughout the East who kept the faith of Chalcedon and hated the Henotikon. The number of appeals that came from the East to Rome prove this. However, it may be said that, at least outwardly, the Emperor did succeed in imposing his formula on the great mass of the Eastern Church, in its bishops. Those who would not accept it were replaced by others who would. Acacius of Constantinople naturally signed the formula he himself had prepared. He becomes the ring-leader of these signers. Peter Mongos also naturally signed. So he was intruded into the see of Alexandria (482); John Talaia, the Catholic Patriarch, who refused to sign, was banished and came to Rome. Mongos found many in Egypt who accepted the Henotikon and so came into communion with him; but among his own Monophysites a party was formed which would not have the Henotikon because it was not sufficiently Monophysite. These became the "Akephaloi" (8) who looked upon Timothy the Cat as the last lawful Patriarch. Peter the Fuller signed and reigned at Antioch. Martyrios of Jerusalem signed, and the great number of Eastern bishops. Many of these said afterwards that they had only done so from fear of the Emperor.

---

(8) Akephaloi, "those without a head".

Meanwhile at first the Pope (Simplicius) did not know what had happened in the East. He was about to recognize Talaia of Alexandria, when Zeno wrote to say that Talaia had been guilty of perjury and other crimes, and asked him to acknowledge Mongos. Simplicius at first suspended his recognition of Talaia, till he had heard more of the charges against him. But he would never recognize Mongos, who was known as a leader of Monophysism. Acacius would not send any notice to Rome about what was happening in the East. Simplicius complains of this ([9]). He died in 483, and was succeeded by Pope Felix II (483-492) ([10]). Felix sent legates to Constantinople to find out what was happening there. Talaia had come to Rome in 483 and had told the Pope about the Henotikon. The legates were two bishops, Vitalis and Misenus. They were to summon Acacius to a Roman synod to answer the charges of Talaia, to insist that no attack on Chalcedon could be tolerated, and to demand the expulsion of Mongos from Alexandria. The monks of a monastery at Constantinople who were called the "Akoimetoi" ([11]) were known to be faithful to the council. The legates had instructions to hold with them and their abbot Cyril ([12]). But the legates, when they arrived, took bribes and listened to all Acacius and Zeno told them. They came back with a report favouring Mongos. So Felix, having considered the matter, summoned a synod of sixty-seven bishops at Rome. In this he annulled all that his legates had decided, deposed them, excommunicated Mongos; and, since Acacius had refused to accept his warning, pronounced deposition and excommunication on him too. This synod was held in 484; it is the beginning of the Acacian schism ([13]). From now, for thirty-five years (till 519), there was schism between East and West. It should be noticed that the immediate reason of Acacius's excommunication was that he was in communion with Mongos. Mongos was a hardened Monophysite; it was impossible for a Catholic to be in communion with him. Afterwards, when Mongos and Acacius were dead, the schism continued as long as the Eastern bishops kept the names of these two in the official diptychs of their Liturgy. This was what Rome would not tolerate; she refused to admit to her communion anyone who, by reciting the names of Mongos of Alexandria and Acacius of Constantinople, admitted the position these had taken up. Not till all the East agreed to erase these names from its diptychs was union restored.

At the same time as he excommunicated Acacius the Pope sent a letter to Zeno complaining of the way the legates Vitalis and Misenus had been bribed, telling him that he must make his choice between communion with the see of Peter and communion with Mongos, and

---

([9]) Simpl., ep. 18, ad Acacium (Thiel, pp. 208-212); ep. 19, ad Zenonem (ib. 213-215).

([10]) Otherwise called Felix III, if the antipope at the time of Liberius is counted as Felix II (357-365).

([11]) "Akoimetoi", "Sleepless". They kept up an unbroken cycle of public prayer, day and night.

([12]) Felix II, ep. 1-4 (Thiel, 222-241); Evagrius, iii. 19 (P.G. lxxxvi. 2636-2637).

([13]) Evagrius, iii. 21 (P.G., lxxxvi. 2640-2641); Liberatus, Brev. 17 (P.L., lxviii. 1026-1030).

protesting against such interference in the affairs of the Church by the State as was the Henotikon (14). In October, 485, Felix renewed the excommunication of Mongos and Acacius and pronounced deposition against Peter the Fuller at Antioch. Acacius answered by striking the Pope's name from his diptychs. The schism was now complete. But many monks at Constantinople kept communion with Rome, notably the Akoimetoi.

Acacius died excommunicate in 489. He was succeeded by Fravitas (15), who died three months later. Fravitas began negotiations with the Pope and asked to be restored to his communion. But he also kept relations with Mongos. The Pope demanded as a condition of communion that he should erase the names of Mongos and Acacius from his diptychs. He would not do so, and he too died in schism. But from now begin constant negotiations of the East with Rome. The Patriarchs of Constantinople, one after another, ask for reunion with Rome. The difficulty each time is that they will not reject the names of Acacius and Mongos. It was not till at last they agreed to do so that union was restored. Fravitas was succeeded by Euphemius (490-496). Mongos died in 490; but his name remained just as much a difficulty, since it, like that of Acacius, was merely transferred to the diptychs of the dead.

It is important to understand why Rome made such a point of the erasure of the names from diptychs in the East. Certainly we may pray for anyone, dead or living. There was no idea of preventing private prayers for dead heretics; indeed the more guilty a man was in his life, the more he may be considered to need our prayers, since we should never despair of the eventual salvation of anyone. But the public reading of names in diptychs is another matter. The Church allows this honour only to her own members. To read the name of a living bishop in the diptychs was always a recognized sign of communion with him. In the same way, to read the name of a dead man in the diptychs of the faithful departed was a sign that he was considered to have died in the communion of the Church; particularly in the case of notorious people like Mongos and Acacius it would mean approbation of what they had done and refusal to acknowledge their excommunication. The Henotikon had produced a grievous schism, it had tampered with the faith of Chalcedon; after all the trouble Monophysism had given, it had made deplorable concessions to those heretics. So the Popes during this schism steadfastly refused their communion to anyone who maintained the principles of the Henotikon by reading publicly in church the names of its authors. The attitude of Rome was (to quote already the Formula of Hormisdas) that "whoever joined in communion with them (the Monophysite leaders) has deserved the same sentence of condemnation as they did." It is true that by this uncompromising attitude the Popes put off reunion for some time. If they

(14) Felix II, ep. 4 (Thiel. 240-241).
(15) Otherwise Flavitas.

had been content to ignore this point of naming Acacius and others in the diptychs, the trouble would have been healed sooner. But by being quite firm they obtained eventually all they demanded. The Byzantine Church did eventually exclude the names of heretics from her diptychs, and so gave up all appearance of admitting the concessions of the Henotikon.

Euphemios of Constantinople acknowledged the decrees of Chalcedon, rejected communion with Mongos, and restored the name of the Pope to his diptychs. But he would not remove those of his two predecessors, Acacius and Fravitas; so the schism continued. Meanwhile the Emperor Zeno died in 491 and was succeeded by Anastasios I (491-518). At his coronation he swore to maintain the faith of Chalcedon; however, he thought it politic not to withdraw the Henotikon. Indeed, gradually he favoured the Monophysites more and more, so that at last he became one himself. Pope Felix II died in 492. He was succeeded by Gelasius I (492-496). Gelasius had already distinguished himself in the Roman clergy; as Pope he maintained exactly the same policy as had his precedessors. He too demanded as a condition of communion with the Holy See unqualified acceptance of Chalcedon and the omission of the names of Acacius, Mongos, and their accomplices from the diptychs. Anastasios was not excommunicated formally. But it seems that he incurred implicit excommunication as one of the followers of Acacius, inasmuch as he maintained the Henotikon. At first the Pope (Felix II) had wished him well at his coronation. Later he complained that he had been unjustly excommunicated. Gelasius writes to Faustus, the Roman legate at Constantinople: "What does it mean that the Emperor says he has been irreligiously excommunicated by us, since my predecessor not only did not mention his name, but even, when he had attained royal power, he wrote to say that he rejoiced at his promotion as Emperor; and I, although I have never received any letter from him, nevertheless, as you know, took care to greet him by letters of honour. My predecessors removed from the communion of the Apostolic See the bishops who themselves confessed that they had communicated with heretics" ([16]). The complaints of the court of Constantinople and of its bishops at this time are seen in the letter of Gelasius "to the Eastern bishops," ([17]) in which he answers them one by one. The Byzantines urged first, that Mongos was not really so bad; his elevation to the see of Alexandria was a necessity because the people clamoured for him; the Emperor had only given way to his fear of greater evils; in later years he had improved. Then they said that the Emperor is a Catholic; they complained that Acacius had been excommunicated solely because he kept communion with Mongos; but the Emperor had forced him to do so; there was no strain of evil morals or heresy against Mongos really. In answer to this, Gelasius says that Mongos was an undoubted Monophysite to the end; Acacius himself had at first declared

([16]) Gelasius, ep. 10, ad Faustum, c. 2 (Thiel, pp. 341-342).
([17]) Ep. I, ad Orientales Episcopos (Thiel, pp. 287-311).

him a heretic and had excommunicated him with all his followers; by becoming one of these afterwards, Acacius had fallen into his own sentence. It is not true that Mongos had been ordained by Salophakiolos (as they said); he had been ordained by erection; Salophakiolos had always refused to be in communion with him. Even if he had repented, that would be sufficient reason for admitting him to penance and eventually to communion, but not for leaving him Patriarch of Alexandria. He was an intruded usurper in that see, of which Talaia was lawful bishop. The Pope explains that wordly considerations such as the tumult of a mob or the Emperor's displeasure, cannot be admitted as reasons for betraying the faith. If it were lawful to hold communion with Monophysites it would be equally lawful to do so with Arians or any other heretics: and where would the faith be then? The letter is a very clear statement of the issue at this juncture (18). However, in spite of the schism, Gelasius does not want to be more severe against the schismatics than is necessary. At this point he explains that the Roman Church does not deny baptism or holy orders conferred by Acacius or his clergy (19).

In the year 496 Gelasius died and was succeeded by Pope Anastasius II (20) (496-498). In the same year Euphemios of Constantinople fell foul of the Emperor (21) and was deposed. Makedonios II (496-511) become Patriarch in his place. He too had to sign the Henotikon at his accession. By now the compromise of Zeno had shifted almost entirely towards the Monophysite side. The leaders of that party held the chief sees in the East. Severus became Patriarch of Antioch in 512; John, also a Monophysite, held the see of Jerusalem; John Machiota was Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria (507-517) (22). The Emperor had gone over completely to that side. They wanted Makedonios of Constantinople to summon a synod to reject Chalcedon, but he refused to do this. Theodore Lector says: "Makedonios answered that he could do nothing without a general council, over which the Pope must preside" (23). Meanwhile Pope Symmachus (498-514) had succeeded Anastasius II. Makedonios was deposed in 511, since he refused to take a definite Monophysite line, and Timothy I (511-518) succeeded him. Already letters from bishops and people all over the East were arriving in Rome, entreating the Pope to put end to the schism. While the chiefs were now open Monophysites, the Catholics, of whom there was always a considerable number, turned all the more to Rome and hoped for the end of the Schism. Symmachus had correspondence with those in the East who remained faithful to Chalcedon. When he died in 514

(18) See especially the ss. 2-14, 32-33.
(19) Gelasius ep. 3, ad Euphemium; 12 ad Anastasium (Thiel, pp. 312-321).
(20) During his short reign both Pope and Emperor had the same name, Pope Anastasius II (496-498) and the Emperor Anastasius I (491-518).
(21) Apparently he would not move far enough in the Monophysite direction.
(22) From Talaia's flight in 482 all the Patriarchs of Alexandria are Monophysites, to Paul I (541-544).
(23) Hist. Eccl., ii. 24 (P.G., lxxxvi. 196).

he was succeeded by Hormisdas (514-523) [24], who at last was able to make an end of the schism. In 514 fear of the rebellion of Vitalianus made the Emperor Anastasios turn for a time to Rome. But as soon as this danger was over he went back to Monophysism. A synod of 200 bishops met at Heraclea to end the schism; but the Emperor made them disperse without having done anything. So things continued as long as Anastasios lived. All the Eastern Patriarchates were now occupied by Monophysites; Rome continued to refuse her communion to all who named heretics in the diptychs; but throughout the East was a large party that desired reunion and kept up relations with the Pope.

The death of the Emperor Anastasios in 518 brought about a complete reaction. He was succeeded by Justin I (518-527), who was already influenced by his nephew the Comes Justinian, the future Emperor Justinian the Great (527-565). Justin and Justinian at once reversed the situation. From the beginning they took their stand, without ambiguity, on the Catholic side. They deposed the Monophysite leaders, insisted on acceptance of Chalcedon, and set about to restore communion with Rome. John II (518-520) had succeeded Timothy as Patriarch of Constantinople. He accepted the new situation willingly, summoned a synod in 518, abandoned the Henotikon, begged the Emperor to restore the exiled Catholic bishops, to expel the heretical ones, and to insist on unqualified acceptance of Chalcedon. This synod then asked Pope Hormisdas to send legates to restore union. Hormisdas demanded the conditions on which his precedessors had always insisted. These were granted at once. The names of Acacius, Mongos, and all other heretics were removed from the diptychs; the Patriarch, bishops, and Emperor signed the formula sent by the Pope. Then on Easter Day (March 24), 519, union with Rome was restored. The legates remained a year in Constantinople, arranging the restoration of Catholic bishops. Only in Egypt did the Monophysites still succeed in maintaining their line. Otherwise the Eastern Church was now again Catholic. Rome had not modified her attitude in any point. So, after thirty-five years of schism, she won all she had demanded. This Acacian schism is one of the long schisms which, although healed in time, nevertheless did enormous harm by weakening the sense of unity and so preparing the way for the final schism of the eleventh century.

3. *Approaches To Rome From the East*

We have already noticed that during the schism there were constant appeals to Rome from those in the East who were not prepared to reject the Council of Chalcedon. It was during the negotiations thus caused that the Formula of Hormisdas first appears.

---

[24] He is the only Pope of that name. He is a saint, as are also Simplicius, Felix II, Gelasius I, Anastasius II, Symmachus.

In 512 a number of Eastern bishops sent a piteous appeal to Pope Symmachus, imploring him to come to their help against the spread of Monophysism. They quote I Pet. 18-19, and add: "Thus taught the blessed Prince of the glorious Apostles, whose throne Christ, the best shepherd, has committed to thy Beatitude ... imitating whom, most holy and blessed one, hasten to help us, as blessed Paul, your teacher, hastened to help the Macedonians ... If Acacius has been anathematized because of his friendship with the Alexandrines, or rather Eutychians, who are opposed to and anathematize the most holy and blessed Pope Leo and the synod held at Chalcedon, why are we considered heretics by you, and why are we under an anathema, who embrace that holy [25] letter and what was said in the holy council?" Then they describe the persecution of Catholics by Acacius and his party [26]. Symmachus answers "to the beloved brethren, all bishops, priests, deacons, archimandrites, and to all orders and people throughout Illyricum, Dardania, and both the Dacias". He sympathizes with their trouble, but insists on his conditions. He says he will never admit to communion those who are in communion with Eutyches, Dioscor, Timothy the Cat, Peter Mongos, and Acacius. "But," he adds, "if anyone, considering his own salvation, desires to obey the Apostolic judgements, when he has separated himself from these, he may know himself to be without doubt a sharer in our communion." [27].

Dorotheus of Thessalonica had passed over to the party of Timothy I of Constantinople now more and more openly Monophysite. So, in 515, forty bishops of Illyricum and Greece separated themselves from him and held a synod, which sent legates to Rome to announce that they desired communion with the Holy See.

The next year, 516, a synod in the south of Illyricum, in the old province of Epirus, chose a certain John to be Metropolitan of Nicopolis. John sent a deacon, Rufinus, to announce his election to Pope Hormisdas; he protests his adherence to Chalcedon and his detestation of the Monophysite chiefs; he declares that he adheres without reserve to the Dogmatic Letter of Leo the Great, and asks the Pope what he is to do. All the members of the Synod at the same time send a letter to the Pope, asking him to recognize their new Metropolitan. The Pope tells John to be faithful to the Catholic faith; he sends by a subdeacon, Pullio, an *Indiculus*, that is, an instruction as to how schismatics are to be reconciled to the Church. In a second letter he sends a form to be signed by all who desire communion with the Holy See [28]. This form is the Formula of Hormisdas. It was signed by all, as we shall see; so Illyricum returned to unity with Rome. It was on the basis of the same formula that John II of Constantinople, his bishops, Justin and Justinian, returned to union in 519.

---

(25) "Solam illam epistolam". Thiel corrects "solam" to "sanctam" (p. 711).
(26) Ep. 12, orientalium episcoporum ad Symmachum, 2-3 (Thiel, pp. 710-711).
(27) Ep. 13 (ib. 717-722).
(28) Ep. 2, ad Johannem Metr. Nicopoleos, 19 Nov. 516 (Mansi, viii. 407-408).

4. *The Formula*

The document by which reunion after the Acacian schism was restored, now known as the "Formula of Hormisdas," was generally headed "Regula fidei" (29). It is not known who composed it, though it probably was written, in the first case, at Rome. It is in the form of an address to the Pope, praying for restoration of communion with him. So it was to be signed and sent to Rome. The first certain notice of the form we have is when it was sent to the Emperor in 515. But before this some of its expressions occur in applications for reunion sent to the Pope. Felix II in his first letter to Zeno anticipates one of its phrases when he says: "Is it not my faith which the Lord himself showed to be alone true and not to be overcome by any adversity, when he promised that the gates of hell should never prevail against his Church, founded on my confession?" (30). The bishops of Dardania write to Pope Gelasius I in words which suggest those of the Formula: "It is our wish and promise to obey your commands in all things and, as we have received from our fathers, to keep unstained all the precepts of the Apostolic See, which has been conferred on your life and merits; and to guard with blameless devotion the orthodox religion, of which you are the preacher, as well as the intelligence of us rustics will allow. We had already avoided the company of Eutyches, Peter (Mongos), Acacius... even before your command. Much more now, after the warning of the Apostolic See, is it necessary for us to keep from that pollution. If any have followed or do follow the sect of the said Eutyches, or Peter, or Acacius, or think to mix themselves with their accomplices and comrades, they are to be in every way avoided by us, who intend to keep the divine commands of the Apostolic See and the laws of our fathers. And if any in evil intention, which we neither think nor wish, desire to be separated from the Apostolic See, we confess ourselves alien from their company (31).

In 515 the Formula appears for the first time. Pope Hormisdas then sent it to the Emperor Anastasios, telling him that all bishops must sign it. The Legates are to say to him: "You have here the text of a form, edited from the archive of the Church, according to which they must confess" (32). It appears next as sent to the Illyrian bishops under John of Nicopolis in 516. In 517 Hormisdas sends the same form, with a few verbal differences, to the Spanish bishops. It is to be signed by Easterns there who ask for communion with them. The Pope's letter says: "We send a form (libellum) under which, if anyone of the Eastern clergy demands your communion, he can he admitted. In this form it is known that many in Thrace and Scythia

(29) It is always referred to as "libellus" in the contemporary correspondence.
(30) Felix II: ep. I, ad Zenonem (Thiel, p. 224).
(31) Ep. ii., episcoporum Dardaniae ad Gelasium (Thiel, pp. 348-349).
(32) "Habetis textum libelli ex scrinio ecclesiae, juxta quem debeant profiteri": ep. 7 (Thiel, 753).

and Illyricum or old Epirus, rejoicing to come to the truth and abstain from wrong, have been received" (33).

The main object of the Formula is the renunciation of heretics and their communion. The man who signs it anathematizes Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscor of Alexandria, Timothy the Cat, Peter Mongos, and Acacius. He also makes the statement that whoever joins in communion with these heretics deserves the same condemnation as they do. Then comes the renunciation of Peter the Fuller of Antioch.

But what has given importance to the Formula is rather the very explicit statements it contains about the authority and teaching of the Holy See. First it says that, because of our Lord's promise to St. Peter, "religion has always been kept immaculate in the Apostolic See." These words played a great part in the discussion about Papal infallibility at the Vatican Council. Then at the end comes the statement that in the communion of the Apostolic See is the full and true solidity of the Christian religion, and the identification between "those who do not consent with the Apostolic See," and "those who are banished from the communion of the Catholic Church." So we have in this Formula an assertion of Papal infallibility, in the sense of the Vatican Council, and a declaration of the necessity of communion with Rome for membership of the Catholic Church. This was signed by practically the whole of Christendom (except, of course, the heretical Nestorian and Monophysite sects) in the years 516 to 519, and again in 869.

5. *The Signing of the Formula*

It remains to see how the Formula of Hormisdas was signed. In the letter of Hormisdas to John of Nicopolis in 516 the Pope says: "The exposition of thy faith, agreeing with the judgement of the Apostolic See, has rejoiced our soul." Yet in the letter from the bishops of the synod "not everything is expressed which belongs to the laws of the Church, as it is in yours. Therefore we have sent a form which they must sign, because all bishops (sacerdotes) of your parts who have returned to the communion of the Apostolic See have signed this profession" (34). The instructions of Pullio the Legate are: "So thou shalt act, that after the Bishop of Nicopolis has received our letter, he shall gather together all the bishops whom he has in his province (paroecia) and shall make them sign the form which is added to the letter to him. But if this bishop says that it would be burdensome to gather together the bishops, let him send with three persons to each bishop, so that, in thy presence, they may sign the said letter" (35). So the Illyrian

(33) Ep. 51, ad omnes episcopos Hispaniae (Mansi, xiii. 467).
(34) Ep. 9, ad Ioh. Nicop. (Mansi, viii. 407).
(35) Indiculus per Pullonem subdiaconum (Ib., 408).

bishops signed; though I do not find whether they saved Pullio trouble by coming together to do so, or whether he had to travel round the country to each.

In the year 517 Hormisdas warned all Eastern bishops that they "should return to the Rock on which the Church is built" (36). In 519 he demanded that all should sign this Formula. His legates, Felix and Dioscor, deacons, and Blandus, priest, report to him the result of their journey in Illyricum and Greece. At Scampina (37), "before we entered the city the venerable Troius, the bishop, came out to meet us. In our presence and in that of his clergy and the nobility of the city he signed the Formula. We received him on the steps (38) in the presence of all the clergy and people, as is related by thy servant Peter, notary of the holy Roman Church." The same thing took place in Lignidus.

Before the great reconciliation of the whole Byzantine Church in 519, John II of Constantinople writes to Hormisdas quoting the Formula. Then he tells him that it has been accepted by all the Byzantine bishops (39). In 519 Hormisdas writes to the Emperor: "What they (the Byzantine bishops) must do is contained in our letters and in the formula we have sent" (40). Justin answers saying: "Know that the form which thou didst command to be offered has been signed by him (the Patriarch)"; and again: "all have eagerly agreed to fulfil the desire of both thy see and that of Constantinople" (41). Justinian, then Comes, afterwards Emperor, writes that all has been done as Hormisdas wished (42). John II of Constantinople was succeeded by Epiphanios (520-536). He reports to the Pope: "As for those whom your Apostolic See has condemned and forbidden to be named in the holy diptychs, neither do I cause them to be named in the holy mysteries" (43). Both he and Justinian quote the Formula again in writing to Hormisdas (44). Rusticus, deacon of Pope Virgilius (537-555), says it was signed by about 2,500 Eastern bishops (45).

At the end of the Acacian schism, then, the Formula of Hormisdas was signed by the bishops of Illyricum and Greece, by the Patriarch of Constantinople and the bishops of his Patriarchate, by the Emperors Justin and Justinian. In the West it was signed by the Eastern clergy in Spain.

---

(36) Ep. 29 (Thiel, p. 801).

(37) Scampina (Scampa) is a small town S.E. of Durazzo; Lignidus is now Ochrida, on the lake. Ep. 59, Felicis, Dioscori, Blandi (Thiel, 850-852).

(38) The steps of the church or of the sanctuary.

(39) Ep. 61, Johannis Const. (Thiel, 852-854); ep. 65 (ib., 858-861).

(40) Ep. 46, ad Iustinum Imp. (ib., 835-836).

(41) Ep. 66, Iustini (ib., 861).

(42) Ep. 68, Iustiniani comitis (ib., 864-865).

(43) Mansi, viii, 503.

(44) Ib., 502-518.

(45) Contra *Acephalos* (Migne, P.L., lxvii. 1251-1253).

Three centuries later the Formula appears again. In the first session of the Fourth Council of Constantinople (869) [46], in which the first schism of Photius was healed, all the Fathers, Latin and Greek, signed a form modelled on this one, which, while changing the names of the heretics condemned, substituting Photius and his party for the Monophysites, quotes the clauses about the primacy and infallible teaching of the Roman See [47].

Lastly, the Formula, having been much discussed during the Vatican Council in 1870, is quoted as a witness of Papal infallibility from the early Church in the fourth chapter of the fourth session [48].

We may now see the text of Hormisdas's "regula fidei". It exists in two forms, one as sent to John of Nicopolis and the Illyrian bishops in 516, one as sent to the Spanish bishops in 517. Although there are only a few verbal differences between these forms, considering the great importance of the document it will be well to give both in full with a translation. The original is in Latin. Only in the acts of the Fourth Council of Constantinople do we find a Greek version. It seems probable that the Byzantine bishops in 519 signed the Formula in Greek; but that text is not extant. With regard to the Illyrian form it should be noted that it is not found at the end of the letter to John of Nicopolis. The text which follows that letter in Mansi is added by Severinus Binius [49] from a Vatican codex. The Spanish form is the appendix to Hormisdas's letter li. "ad omnes episcopas Hispaniae." Both texts are reprinted exactly from Mansi: *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (Florence, 31 vols., 1759 *seq.*) vol. viii. The Illyrian form will be found at pp. 407-408, the Spanish form at pp. 467-468.

It will be noticed that the document is in the form of an address to the Pope. By signing it, the bishop accepted its terms as his own.

* * *

REGVLA FIDEI SEV FORMVLA SANCTI HORMISDAE PAPAE

Textus illyricus

Prima salus est, regulam rectae fidei custodire, et a constitutis patrum nullatenus deviare. Et quia non potest domini Jesu Christi praetermitti sententia dicentis: Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedifi-

---

(46) This is the council we count as the eighth Oecumenical synod.

(47) The text in Latin and Greek is printed in Hergenrother: *Photius, Patriarch von Constantinopel* (Regensburg, 1867), ii pp. 78-80 note 16. The Greek text is shorter than the Latin, but contains the same essential clauses. See Mansi, xvi. 316 and Hefele-Leclerq, *Histoire des Conciles* (Paris, 1911), iv. pp. 486-490.

(48) Denzinger: *Enchiridion*, ed. xi (Freiburg, 1911), p. 488.

(49) Vicar General at Koln († 1641), author of a *Collectio Conciliorum* (Koln, 1606), 4 vols.

cabo ecclesiam meam, etc., *haec quae dicta sunt rerum probantur effectibus, quia in sede apostolica immaculata est semper servata religio. Ab hac ergo spe et fide separari minime cupientes, et patrum sequentes in omnibus constituta, anathematizamus omnes haereticos; praecipue Nestorium haereticum, qui quondam Constantinopolitanae fuit urbis episcopus, damnatus in concilio Ephesino a Caelestino Papa urbis Romae, et a sancto Cyrillo Alexandrinae civitatis antistite. Una cum ipso anathematizantes Eutychen et Dioscorum Alexandrinum, in sancta synodo, quam sequimur et amplectimur, Chalcedonensi damnatos. His Timotheum adiicientes parricidam, Aelurum cognomento, et discipulum quoque eius atque sequacem Petrum, vel Acacium, qui in eorum communionis societate permansit; quia quorum se communioni miscuit, illorum similem meruit in damnatione sententiam. Petrum nihilominus Antiochenum damnamus cum sequacibus suis, et omnium suprascriptorum.*

Quopropter suscipimus et approbamus omnes epistolas Leonis papae, universas quas religione Christiana conscripsit. Unde, sicut praediximus, sequentes in omnibus apostolicam sedem, et praedicantes eius omni constituta, spero ut in una communione vobiscum, quam sedes apostolica praedicat, esse merear, in qua est verax Christianae religionis soliditas. Promittens etiam, sequestratos a communione ecclesiae, id est, non consentientes sedi apostolicae, eorum nomina inter sacra non esse recitanda mysteria. Hanc autem professionem meam manu mea subscripsi, et tibi Hormisdae sancto et venerabili Papae urbis Romae obtuli. Data xv *Kal. Aprilis, Agapito viro clarissimo consule.*

RULE OF FAITH OR FORMULA OF SAINT HORMISDAS POPE

Illyrian text

The first salvation is to keep the rule of right faith, and in no way to wander from the laws of the fathers. And that the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, who said: *Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church, etc.*, may not be ignored is proved by the result; because in the Apostolic See religion has always been kept immaculate. Desiring therefore by no means to be separated from this hope and faith, and following in all things the laws of the fathers, we anathematize all heretics; especially the heretic Nestorius, who was at one time Bishop of the city of Constantinople, who was condemned in the Council of Ephesus by Celestine, Pope of the city of Rome, and by Saint Cyril, Bishop of the city of Alexandria. Together with him we anathematize Eutyches and Dioscor of Alexandria, who were condemned in the holy Synod of Chalcedon, which we follow and embrace. Adding to these Timothy the parricide (1), called the Cat, his disciple also and follower

(1) Parricide not merely because he was a Monophysite, as I thought formerly (*Orth. Eastern Church*, p. 86, n. 1). This is an allusion to the murder of Proterius, his lawful Patriarch and spiritual father.

Peter (Mongos); or Acacius, who remained in the company of their communion, because he deserved the same sentence of condemnation as those with whose communion he caused himself to be mixed. Condemning no less Peter of Antioch (Fuller) with his followers, and all named above.

Wherefore we receive and approve all the letters of Pope Leo, whichever he wrote concerning the Christian religion. Hence, as we have said, following the Apostolic See in all things, and teaching its decrees, I hope that I may be worthy to be in the one communion with you, which the Apostolic See teaches, in which is the full and true solidity of the Christian religion. Promising also that the names of those who are banished from the communion of the Catholic Church, that is, those who do not consent to the Apostolic See, are not to be recited in the holy mysteries. This my profession I have signed with my own hand and offer to thee, Hormisdas, holy and venerable Pope of the city of Rome. Given on the 15th of the Kalends of April, the most illustrious Agapitus being consul.

* * *

REGVLA FIDEI SEV FORMVLA SANCTI HORMISDAE PAPAE

Textus hispanicus

Prima salus est, rectae fidei regulam custodire et a constitutis patrum nullatenus deviare. Et quia non potest domini nostri Jesu Christi praetermitti sententia dicentis: Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, etc., *haec quae dicta sunt rerum probantur effectibus: quia in sede apostolica extra maculam semper est catholica servata religio. De qua spe et fide minimo separari cupientes, et patrum sequentes constituta, anathematizamus omnes haereses, et praecipue Nestorium haereticum, qui quondam Constantinopolitanae fuit urbis episcopus, damnatus in concilio Ephesino a Beato Caelestino papa urbis Romae, et a venerabili viro Cyrillo Alexandrinae civitatis antistite. Similiter et anathematizamus Eutychen et Dioscorum Alexandrinum in sancta synodo quam sequimur et amplectimur, Chalcedonensi damnatos, quae secuta sanctum concilium Nicaenum fidem apostolicum praedicavit. Detestamur et Timotheum parricidam, Aelurum cognomento, discipulum quoque ipsius, et sequacem in omnibus Petrum Alexandrinum condemnamus. Et etiam anathematizamus Acacium Constantinopolitanum quondam episcopum ab apostolica sede damnatum, eorum complicem et sequacem, vel qui in eorum communione aut societate per-*

manserint. Qui Acacius quorum se communioni miscuit, ipsorum similem habere meruit in damnatione sententiam. Petrum nihilo minus Antiochenum damnamus cum sequacibus suis et omnibus suprascriptis. Suscipimus autem et probamus epistolas beati Leonis Papae universas, qua de religione Christiana conscripsit, sicut praediximus, sequentes in omnibus apostolicam sedem, et praedicantes eius omnia constituta. Et per omnia spero ut in una communione vobiscum, quem sedes apostolica praedicat, esse merear in qua est integra et vera Christianae religionis, et perfecta soliditas; promittens in sequenti tempore sequestratos a communione ecclesiae catholicae, id est non consentientes sedi apostilicae, eorum nomina inter sacra non recitanda esse mysteria. Quod si in aliquo a mea professione deviare tentavero; his, quos damnavi, complicem me mea sententia esse profiteor. Hanc autem professionem meam ego manu mea subscripsi, et tibi Hormisdae sancto venerabili papae urbis Romae direxi.

RULE OF FAITH OR FORMULA OF SAINT HORMISDAS POPE

Spanish text

The first salvation is to keep the rule of right faith, and in no way to wander from the laws of the fathers. And that the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, who said: *Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church, etc.,* may not be ignored is proved by the result; because in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has always been kept without stain. From which hope and faith wishing by no means to be separated, and following the laws of the fathers, we anathematize all heresies, especially Nestorius the heretic, who was once Bishop of the city of Constantinople, condemned in the council of Ephesus by blessed Celestine, Pope of the city of Rome, and by the venerable man Cyril, bishop of the city of Alexandria. In the same way we also anathematize Eutyches and Dioscor of Alexandria, who were condemned in the holy synod of Chalcedon, which we follow and embrace; which, following the holy Council of Nicaea, taught the Apostolic faith. We detest also Timothy the parricide, called the Cat, also his disciple and follower in all things, Peter of Alexandria. We also anathematize Acacius, at one time Bishop of Constantinople, who was condemned by the Apostolic See, who was their associate and follower; or all who remained in their communion or society. For this Acacius deserved to incur the same sentence of condemnation as those whose communion he shared. No less do we condemn Peter of Antioch with all his followers, and all named above. But we receive and approve all the letters of blessed Leo the Pope, which he wrote concerning the Christian religion; as we have said, following in all things the Apostolic See and

teaching all its laws. And in all things I hope that I may be worthy to be in one communion with you which the Apostolic See teaches, in which is the full and true and perfect solidity of the Christian religion; promising in future that the names of those who are banished from the communion of the Catholic Church, that is those who do not consent to the Apostolic See, shall not be recited in the holy mysteries. But if in anything I attempt to stray from my profession, I confess myself by my own sentence to be an accomplice of those whom I have condemned. This my profession I have signed with my own hand and address to thee, Hormisdas, holy and venerable Pope of the city of Rome.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

After the Evanston Assembly

As was to be expected, a good deal of ecumenical activity and journalistic reappraisal followed in the wake of the Evanston Assembly. Besides the meetings of the various committees of the World Council of Churches subsequent to the Assembly, there were other special convocations both in the United States and in other countries.

One of these latter took place in September at the McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago under the co-chairmanship of Bishop Leslie Newbigin of the Church of South India and the Reverend Dr. D. T. Niles of the Methodist Church of Ceylon. Both of these churchmen had presided over a similar meeting after the Lund Conference of two years ago.

Among the principal topics discussed at this Chicago gathering was a report on the current schemes of unity, with particular emphasis being given to the Ceylon Scheme, the Church of South India, and the North India and Pakistan plan of unity. In the second session of the conference the theme was devoted to a discussion of the "unification of episcopal and non-episcopal ministries". For this the Rev. Oliver S. Tomkins was present to deliver an introductory address. Further sessions of this meeting were given over to a consideration of the principal theological issues relating to Christian unity.

Two other important conferences on the Evanston proceedings took place in England in the fall, one at Oxford under the presidency of the Bishop of Salisbury and one at London under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of Canterbury. In an address to his London audience Dr. Fisher declared that the Ecumenical Movement now occupied a most important place in the affairs of the British Churches, but warned against the expectation of quick results.

Other well-attended meetings were reported by the Ecumenical Press Service as taking place at Edinburgh, Frankfurt, and in Finland.

In the press, meanwhile, the wide interest aroused by the Evanston Assembly was reflected in numerous articles and commentaries both by Catholics and non-Catholics. Among the Catholic periodicals that gave extensive treatment to the Second World Conference were: *Documentation Catholique* for October 17, and the fall numbers of Fr. Christopher Dumont's bulletin, *Vers l'Unité Chrétienne* and the Paris review, *Istina.*

Non-Catholic publications devoted a good deal of space to the subject of Evanston in many countries throughout the world, with a large number of their salient points being quoted in recent news releases by the Ecumenical Press Service.

We find among the different articles cited one by Bishop Hans Lilje of Hanover entitled "Evanston - a Strong Will to Unity". Writing in the German periodical *Sonntagsblatt,* Lutheran Bishop Lilje declared: "The first fact is the most elementary one: the fact that so many peo-

ple met at Evanston from the four corners of the earth proves their desire for unity. The Churches which sent them were thereby expressing and confirming their own determination for this unity. This desire for unity is one of the features in the Church history of today which cannot be gainsaid, stamped with an unmistakably Christian character."

Commenting on the turn of events at Evanston, Dr. Roger Mehl contributed an article to the influential Paris newspaper, *Le Monde* in which he was inclined to be optimistic about the results attained. He indicated, however, that much remained to be done to reach a fuller measure of agreement. "The section which created the most stir," wrote Dr. Mehl, "was undoubtedly the Faith and Order Section which studied the problem of unity under the chairmanship of Archbishop Brilioth of Sweden ... The difficult corner, which has not yet been turned, is precisely that of the nature of the ministry, which in its turn raises the question of the nature of the Church. Is the Church, as the Lutheran-Reformed group maintains, the outcome of the preaching of God's word and the administration of the Sacraments? Or is it rather, as the Orthodox-Anglican bloc maintains, the permanent community grouped around an ordained ministry, going back in history to the Apostles? The Assembly undoubtedly succeeded in limiting and clarifying the discussion, but no solution was found. The day that solution is reached, the main obstacle to unity will be removed".

The Orthodox point of view, in turn, was represented by citations from an interview given to the Greek periodical *Anaplassis* (October 15) by Professor P. Trembellas of the University of Athens. "I can confirms", stated the Orthodox theologian, "that, thanks to God, this Assembly had as a result agreement between all the Orthodox representatives of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, the Patriarchate of Antioch, the Russians of America and France, and the Greek Orthodox of America. This agreement resulted in the delivering to the full house of the Assembly of two declarations, in which the Orthodox beliefs were stated clearly in distinction to the Protestant ones. In these messages it was declared among other things that in spite of the schisms which separate it, the one and holy Apostolic Church has not ceased to exist; that for its reunion we should re-establish the tradition of the Church of the seven Ecumenical Councils; that the preservation of this tradition by us is not due to our deserving it but to God's Providence to keep His treasure as a sign of His Divine Power".

In reply to the question regarding the further participation of the Orthodox in future assemblies of the World Council of Churches, Professor Trembellas was of an affirmative opinion. He insisted, however, on a due preparation on the part of the Orthodox delegates and clear unequivocal statements of Orthodox belief during the discussions.

Publications of the Evanston Assembly

The Department of Information of the World Council of Churches

has announced that most of the official publications relating to the Evanston Assembly are now available in English and may be obtained through one or the other of the World Council offices at New York, and London. The only major document not yet ready is the Official Report of the Second Assembly which is expected to appear early in the spring. The official Assembly material now in print comprises the following titles:

1. The Evanston Message.
2. Reports of the Individual Sections (Faith and Order, Evangelism, Social Questions, International Affairs, Intergroup Relations, the Laity).
3. Christ, the Hope of the World. Documents on the main theme of the Assembly.
4. The Christian Hope and the Task of the Church. (Includes the Six Surveys and the Report of the Advisory Commission on the main theme).
5. The First Six Years. A Report of the Central Committee of the W.C.C. on various activities in the recent past.

New Semester at Graduate School of Ecumenical Studies

An opening service on October 1st, at which prominent Protestant theologians and other churchmen were present, inaugurated the third semester of the Graduate School of Ecumenical Studies at Bossey in Switzerland. The course, which is commanding more interest, is sponsored by the World Council of Churches at the Ecumenical Institute in Bossey and is under the supervision of the Faculty of Theology at the University of Geneva where it enjoys full accreditation. At the present time students are enrolled from twelve different countries and represent most of the major Protestant bodies as well as the Eastern Orthodox Churches. (EPS)

Plan for Major Church Merger in Canada

Delegates at a biennal meeting of the General Council of the United Church of Canada recently approved a proposed plan for eventual merger with the Anglican Church in Canada. The resolution adopted by the Council called for a detailed plan to be worked out between the two denominations envisioning the "ideal of a reunited Church". This plan would then be submitted to the individual churches concerned for their consideration and approval.

If the plan in question were to be adopted by both denominations, it would lead to the creation of a new Church with a combined membership of almost 5,000,000, made up of 2,850,000 adherents of the United Church and about 2,000,000 members of the Church of England.

The idea of a prospective merger has been considered by leaders of both communions for over ten years. The initiative was taken by the Anglican Church in 1943 when Archbishop Owen issued an invitation to other denominations for reunion talks.

Referring to the unitive negotiations under way, Dr. Harold Young, a spokesman for the United Church was quoted as saying: "We have done everything possible to increase fellowship and understanding ... There are no issues on which members may not hope to find a way. Both Churches are definitely committed to organic union as our aim. We did not talk about that at first. We talked of co-operation. But now we are committed to organic union as the goal." (EPS)

Jubilee Year of Reunion in Malabar

A special jubilee year in Malabar will mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the return of a group of separated Jacobite Christians to union with the Holy See. This announcement was made in late September in a joint pastoral by Archbishop Mar Severios, Bishop of Tiruvalla and Bishop Mar Gregorius, Apostolic Administrator of the Archdiocese of Trivandrum. The celebration will continue until September 1955, at which time twenty-five years will have elapsed since the late Mar Ivanios began his reunion movement towards Rome with four of his followers, all of whom were reconciled with the Holy See on September 20, 1930. Their return added a new Eastern rite to the Church—the Syro-Malankara, which employs the Malayalam language.

Since reuniting with Rome, the former Jacobites have undergone a remarkable growth. Today they number over 80,000 and are served by two Archbishops, one Titular Metropolitan, three Bishops, and 168 priests. The community likewise possesses about 300 churches and chapels, two minor seminaries, a college, fourteen high schools, and sixty primary schools. In addition, there are several religious communities of both men and women to be found in both dioceses of the Syro-Malankara Rite.

The Malankarese are descended from the Indians of the Malabar Coast, who in accordance with tradition were brought to the faith by St. Thomas the Apostle. By the end of the fifth century, however, they had fallen into schism from Rome and for centuries afterwards were provided with bishops by the Nestorian Patriarch of Mesopotamia in the Near East.

Towards the end of the 13th century, India's Christians once more came into contact with Rome when missionaries from the West began to arrive on the Malabar Coast. More than two centuries later they were also visited by St. Francis Xavier who commended the incumbent bishop, Mar Jacob as being "very obedient to the customs of the Holy Mother Church of Rome". Although Mar Jacob had been sent to Malabar by the Nestorian Patriarch, he had been strongly influenced by the Western missionaries, especially those from Portugal.

Through the efforts of the missionaries considerable progress was made in promoting reunion with the Holy See so that by the end of the 16th century a special synod was held at Diamper (1599) at which the greater part of the Malabar Christians returned to the Church. Some

of these adopted the Latin rite, while others retained a form of the Antiochene (Syriac).

In 1653, however, a new schism occurred in which all but 400 of the 200,000 Malabarese Catholics who had been reunited to the Church fifty years earlier broke off relations with Rome. This schism has been generally attributed to the overzealous and tactless efforts on the part of Portuguese missionaries and officials who sought to replace native religious practices by their own.

Ten years later the greater part of the new separatists—members of 84 of the 116 Malabar parishes—returned to communion with Rome. The remaining parishes, however, continued in schism. This latter group, known as the Malankarese, turned eventually to the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch in Syria for its bishops. (The Jacobite schism began in Syria in the 6th century and derives its name from Bishop Jacob al-Baradai who had adhered to the Monophysite heresy).

At the present time a number of the Malankarese still form an independent group of Jacobites. Another large group of over a quarter million, the Mar Thoma Syrian Church is considered as an Eastern Orthodox Church, but possesses certain features of Protestantism. A third group, the one led by Mar Ivanios in 1930, is now in communion with the Holy See. It is to the latter that the pastoral letter of Mar Severios and Mar Gregorius is addressed, announcing the jubilee year of reunion and urging the clergy and laity to pray for the return to the Church of members of their rite who are still separated from her. (NC)

Quebec Center of Prayer for Reunion

Archbishop Maurice Roy of Quebec has approved the organization of an official center of prayer for the reunion of Christendom. The announcement of this step was made in November.

Father Ernest Lemieux, dean of the School of Theology at Laval University, will be in charge of the center and will be assisted by a French-speaking and an English-speaking priest.

Among those who have been invited to preach there are priests of the Notre Dame de Sion community, dedicated to the return of Israel to the Church. Lectures at the center will also be given by Religious of the same community. (NC)

Anglican Periodical Questions Title of World Council

In the fall number of the *Pilot,* the quarterly organ of the Anglican Society for Promoting Catholic Unity, the editorial concerns itself both with the Anglican Congress held at Minneapolis this past summer and with the Evanston Assembly. In the first instance, the editorial takes issue with the method of representation adopted for attendance at Minneapolis; and in the second, it calls into question the value of Christian unification in practical matters, whatever the theological differences of the groups participating. While granting the possibility

that such co-operation creates a friendly atmosphere and mutual respect, the writer points out that within the framework of the Ecumenical Movement no boundary is generally recognized between practical co-operation and doctrinal worship. The result is that a doctrinal chaos is created from ministerial exchanges, 'united services', and inter-communion.

The editorial likewise deplores the inference that is drawn from the name itself of the World Council of Churches. "The fundamental error which vitiates the efforts of the 'Oecumenical' movement is manifest in the title, 'World Council of *Churches*'," it declares. "This, at once, suggests the existence of bodies of a more-or-less equal validity, each of which is, individually, a Church. The 'reunification' of these bodies can thus be accomplished either by mutual accommodation or by federation. In the Creed, however, we profess belief in '*One*, Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church' which, by this very definition, is incapable of division. It is interesting to note that the Nicean Creed emphasizes belief in *one* God, *one* Lord Jesus Christ, and *one* Church. As God is one and incapable of division, so the Church is one and also incapable of division. As God and man is one Christ, so, in the mystical union which is betwixt Christ and His Body, the Church is one. The whole conception of 'Churches' is foreign to the Creed, the New Testament and the Catholic tradition. Consequently, the emphasis should rest upon discovering, not a method of creating a new unity out of diverse traditions, but rather that Unity which is of the very being of the Church, which, by definition, is incapable of division and which, therefore, is manifested in history from the dawn of the new Covenant".

Week of Prayer for Unity again Sponsored by World Council

Continuing the policy adopted over the past number of years, the Commission on Faith and Order has again addressed an appeal to all the member bodies of the World Council of Churches to observe the Week of Prayer for Unity from January 18 to the 25th. This is a reiteration of the appeal made by the same commission in the Report it presented at the Evanston Assembly. Accompanying the letter on this subject to the members of the World Council is a prayer leaflet containing a brief introduction, two special orations, and a litany for unity based the fourth chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. These read in part as follows:

"Two statements made by the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1954 give urgency to the appeal for prayers for Christian unity.

'As we learn more of our unity in Christ, it becomes the more intolerable that we should be divided. We therefore ask you: Is your church seriously considering its relation to other churches in the light of our Lord's prayer that we may be sanctified in the truth and that we may all be one?' *(Assembly Message)*

'The measure of our concern for unity is the degree to which we

pray for it. We cannot expect God to give us unity unless we prepare ourselves to receive His gift by costly and purifying prayer. To pray *together* is to be drawn together'. *(Report of Faith and Order Section)*

"Persons responsible for suggesting special occasions for prayer are asked to set aside appropriate periods for earnest prayers to be offered to God for the unity of His people, now divided. Many will observe the week of January 18-25. Others will choose the season of Pentecost, or another time of the year when church members are able to participate".

Prayers

O God, the Father, in whom is calmness, peace and concord; make up the dissensions which divide us from each other, and bring us back into a unity of love, which may bear some likeness to Thy divine nature. And as Thou art above all things, make us one by the unanimity of a good mind, that through the embrace of charity and the bonds of affection, we may be one, as well in ourselves as in each other; through the grace, mercy, and tenderness of Thy Son, Jesus Christ. *Amen.*

(St. Dionysius, *adapted)*

O Lord Jesus Christ, who didst pray for Thy disciples that they might be one even as Thou art one with the Father: draw us to Thyself, that in common love and obedience to Thee, we may be united to one another in the fellowship of the one Spirit, that the world may believe that Thou art Lord to the glory of God the Father. *Amen.*

Litany for Unity

Almighty God, who didst make Thy Son to be Head of the *ONE BODY*, His Church, that in all things He might have pre-eminence:

Forgive and heal our divisions

Our Fathex, who by the *ONE SPIRIT* hast called and baptized Thy people into the fellowship of the one Body:

Forgive and heal our divisions

Blessed Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hast begotten us again unto the *ONE HOPE* by the resurrection of Thy Son:

Forgive and heal our divisions

O Jesus Christ, who through the sacrifice of Thine own Body and Blood hast shown Thyself to be our *ONE LORD* and Saviour:

Unite us in Thy truth

Son of God, who wilt bring us through unity of the *ONE FAITH* unto a measure of the stature of Thy fulness:

Unite us in Thy truth

Holy Spirit of God, who dost continually grant Thy diverse and fruitful gifts to the people united in the *ONE BAPTISM:*

Unite us in Thy truth

Thou who art the *ONE GOD AND FATHER* of all, who art above all, and through all, and in us all for ever and ever:

Unite us in Thy truth. Amen.

AROUND THE WORLD

ROME

Solemn Closing of the Marian Year

The Marian Year which Pope Pius proclaimed in December 1953 came to a splendid close in Rome with special activities and ceremonies to mark the event. These included the issuance of a new encyclical by the Holy Father entitled *Ad Coeli Reginam* in which a new festival of the Queenship of Mary is announced; a nine-day Marian and Mariological Congress; the coronation at St. Peter's by the Pope of the celebrated painting of Our Lady, *Salus Populi Romani,* as the climax of a great and colorful procession from the Basilica of St. Mary Major; and the closing exercises at the Liberian Basilica presided over by Cardinal Tisserant, Dean of the Sacred College. Other features at the center of Christendom included: pageantry, concerts, Marian conferences, and an impressive exhibit at Palazzo Venezia in which the history of devotion to the Mother of God was reflected in manuscripts, prints, incunabula, and printed books produced over the centuries by the Fathers and other Saints and scholars of the Church.

In crowning the painting of *Salus Populi Romani* in the presence of twenty-five Cardinals and two hundred bishops, the Holy Father delivered an address on the significance of the ceremony in which he declared that there is nothing new about instituting and celebrating the feast of the Queenship of Mary. He pointed out that Christians have addressed Our Lady as Queen for centuries in the prayers of the liturgy, and each rosary ends with "the radiant remembrance of Mary being received into Heaven by her Son and crowned by Him with a royal diadem".

"The origin of Mary's glories," continued the Pope, "the solemn moment which lights up her whole personality and mission, is that in which she, being full of grace, replied to the archangel with the 'fiat' expressing her consent to God's plan. Thus did she become the Mother of God and Queen, receiving the royal office of watching over the unity and peace of the human race".

Earlier the Holy Father had delivered an address in Latin to those participating in the Mariological Congress in which he set forth the norms for procedure. He reminded the theologians present to keep in mind the basic teaching concerning the magisterium, or teaching authority of the Church, without which no one can fully or rightly explain the content of Revelation.

"He departs from truth," affirmed Pope Pius, "who thinks that he can fully define and rightly illustrate the dignity and sublimity of the most Blessed Virgin solely by means of Sacred Scripture, without taking sufficient account of Catholic tradition and the sacred magisterium". He further declared that by following the proper norms, Mariology will make a real progress, investigating ever more fruitfully the place and

dignity of the Blessed Virgin Mary. In this way, he added, Mariology will be able "to avoid all false and immoderate exaltation of truth, and on the other hand, keep itself apart from those who are seized by an empty fear of attributing to the Virgin more than is just". (NC)

Pope Denies Church's Role Limited to Strictly Religious Matters

At the conclusion of the Marian Congress in Rome, the Holy Father held a special reception for the Cardinals and bishops attending in the Hall of Benedictions. On this occasion he delivered an important address in Latin in the first part of which he warned against wrong interpretations of the priesthood of the laity. In the second portion of his allocution he stated with emphasis that those who sought to restrict the Church's authority to purely religious affairs were in error. Far from this limitation, the truth was that the power of the Church extends to the whole make-up of the natural law and to the moral aspects of its foundation, its interpretation, and its application. By natural law the Church meant the law which is instilled by God in the minds of men, distinguishing for them the good from the evil and bidding them to follow the good and avoid the latter. "The keeping of the natural law by God's appointment," said the Pope, "has reference to the road whereby man has to approach his supernatural end"; and on this path his guide is the Church as ordained by Divine Authority.

In the application of this principle to everyday life, the Holy Father said that social questions and other problems not strictly religious—some of them even political—fall within the scope of the Church's authority inasmuch as they pertain to the moral order and as such can, and very often do, hinder man from attaining his final end. As instances of this, Pope Pius listed the following:

1. The purpose and limits of temporal authority.
2. The relations between the individual and society.
3. The so-called totalitarian state.
4. The complete laicization of the state and of public life, as well as of education.
5. The morality of modern warfare, and the question of licit or illicit co-operation in it.
6. The binding power of moral relationship between the various nations.

"Common sense and truth as well," he went on to say "are contradicted by whoever asserts that these and similar problems are outside the field of morals and consequently are, or at least can be, beyond the influence of that authority established by God to see to a just order and to direct the conscience and actions of men along the path to their true and final destiny". *(Oss. Romano)*

Russian Pontifical College Celebrates Twenty-Fifth Anniversary

Early in December, the Russian Pontifical College in Rome (the

Russicum) celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of its foundation by Pope Pius XI in order to train priests for a future apostolate in Russia. The festivities were attended by Cardinal Tisserant, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of the Oriental Church, as well as by other Latin and Byzantine prelates.

Staffed by the Society of Jesus, the Russicum has given training to 120 priests since its inception. While waiting for the day when they will be able to carry out their mission in Russia itself, these priests have devoted themselves to an apostolate among Russian communities in Manchuria, Finland, Japan, Australia, Argentina, Paris, Geneva, Vienna, the United States, and in other countries. There have already been ten martyrs among them, while an additional ten are either imprisoned or interned behind the Iron Curtain.

Although intended at first only for Russian students, the college eventually admitted young men of other nationalities because of a dearth of Russian vocations. Priests also are admitted who wish to dedicate themselves to working among the Russian peoples. All of these students who enter join the Slav-Byzantine Rite, if they do not already belong to it, as part of their preparation for their future mission. Further preparation includes a thorough study of the Russian language, literature, and history. *(C. Herald)*

* * *

ITALY

Italian State Grants Recognition to Protestant Sect

The Italian Council of State issued a ruling in November which confers juridical recognition on a Pentecostal sect known as the Assemblies of God. Originating in the United States in 1914, the sect claims some 370,000 American adherents; in Italy, officials of this body claim a membership of about 100,000.

The decision of the state is of interest because authorities in Italy have so far withheld official recognition from certain newly organized sects from abroad which have aroused popular resentment by a program of aggressive proselytizing. On the other hand many of the leading Protestant denominations have been established in Italy for many years and have enjoyed full freedom under laws guaranteeing freedom of worship.

According to the officials of the sect in Rome, the Council's ruling means that the Assemblies of God will be exempt from taxes, and their pastors can hold services freely. This will place them on the same level as a score of non-Catholic denominations which have been legally recognized in Italy and have been functioning for years without hindrance. These include Waldensians, Methodists, several Baptist groups, the Church of England, Lutherans, Jews, etc. (NC)

* * *

THE UNITED STATES

Annual Message of American Bishops

A statement signed by four American Cardinals and ten archbishops

and bishops warns the American people that the tyranny of atheistic materialism, whether in the form of communism or Godless humanism, is threatening the life of the nation. The statement was issued on November 21 at the close of the Hierarchy's annual meeting in Washington.

"The battle is joined," reads the declaration. "If our nation is to escape the fate of Poland and of China, of Yugoslavia, and of Hungary, and of so many others, if we are to survive as a free Christian nation, then we must be clear-eyed and we must be strong. Some see the enemy only as a political state or group of States, or merely as an economic system. Spiritual vision gives better intelligence of the fact. The enemy is atheistic materialism. Whether it be entrenched in the organs of a foreign State, or in one of our own domestic institutions, it is atheistic materialism that seeks to destroy us. This is the enemy".

"Unless we arrest this religious decline," conclude the bishops, "unless we push back the domestic invasion of materialism, we shall not be able, as history clearly attests, to withstand the enemy from without.

"It is not the true Faith that has failed us; it is we who have failed the Faith. Our nation, if it is to survive, must recover and renew its Christian Faith". (NC)

Eastern Rite Congress in Philadelphia

A three-day National Eucharistic Marian Congress of the Oriental Rites, which was attended by approximately 30,000 people, took place in Philadelphia during the third week in October. Prayers in thanksgiving for the blessings in the free world and prayers for others not so fortunate, particularly those in communist dominated countries, were the main intentions of the gathering sponsored by the Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate of the Byzantine Slavonic Rite.

Besides the large number of the faithful the congress was attended by very many bishops from different countries both of the Eastern and Western rites. Among the cardinals attending were: Gregory Peter XV Cardinal Agagianian, Patriarch of Cilicia of the Armenians from Beirut, Lebanon; Samuel Cardinal Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago, and Thomas Cardinal Tien, S.V.D., exiled Archbishop of Peking, China.

One of the principle features of the congress was the concelebration of the Divine Liturgy at nine altars arranged in the civic auditorium of the Philadelphia Convention Hall. It was celebrated simultaneously in nine different rites: the Byzantine in five variations, the Armenian, the Chaldean, the Maronite, and the Latin.

In his sermon at an evening pontifical Divine Liturgy, Archbishop John F. O'Hara of Philadelphia placed particular emphasis on what the faithful of the Eastern rites have suffered under Communist persecution. He then declared that it was truly providential that there exists in the United States and Canada a flourishing Catholic Church of the Eastern rites which will be ready to help in the restoration of

the persecuted Church behind the Iron Curtain when the day of freedom comes. (NC)

Religious Statistics

The *Yearbook of American Churches for 1955*, which has been regularly sponsored by the National Council of Churches, was recently published with the latest statistics available on the number of church-going Americans. A total of 94,842,845 persons, making up 64 per cent of the country's population, is listed as making up the membership for the 252 religious bodies in the United States. This figure represents a gain of 2.8 per cent over the statistics reported last year. Both Catholics and Protestants, the latter with 189 bodies reporting, showed an increase over the general population growth of 1.7 per cent. Roman Catholic membership for 1953 was given as 31,476,261, an increase of 1,223,824 for 4 per cent; while the numerical gain for Protestant denominations as a whole was stated as being 1,607,362, an increase of 3 per cent, for an over-all total of 55,837,325.

The *Yearbook* also listed the Eastern Orthodox Churches with 2,100,171 members; adherents of Judaism, 5,000,000; the Old Catholic and Polish National Catholic Churches with 366,088 members; and followers of Buddhism as 63,000. The five leading Protestant denominations are listed as being: Baptist (25 bodies) with 17,990,613 members; Methodist (21 bodies) with 11,641,891; Lutheran (20 bodies) with 6,608,951; Presbyterian (10 bodies) with 3,635,077; and Protestant Episcopal with 2,550,831 members.

* * *

ARGENTINA

Catholic Bishops Reply to Peron

Following the surprising turn of events in early November which saw President Juan Peron initiate a Church-state crisis by charging three bishops and a score of priests with being enemies of the state, the two Argentine Cardinals together with the remaining members of the hierarchy prepared a special memorandum for presentation to the leader of their country. In it they expressed the profound sorrow they had experienced by the assertions made in the presidential speech of November 10 and assured Peron that they had been working for the good of their country with the best of intentions. They pointed out that the nation had always depended upon the Church to help its people to attain moral and spiritual greatness, and in fact over the years the nation had seen "development in its religious and cultural life in an atmosphere of peace, which is always necessary for the spiritual welfare and tranquillity of the populace." The memorandum closed inviting the government to supply accurate details to support the contentions made against the bishops and priests in question.

A week later the Archbishops and Bishops of Argentina issued a joint pastoral to their faithful to be read in all the churches in the country. With the present crisis in mind, the pastoral declared that

the mission of the Church cannot be restricted to her temples. It called upon Catholics to comply with their civic duties at all times but without detriment to their religious principles. "The State has natural rights that should be respected by all citizens," the statement read, "but the Church too has her rights, and they must likewise be respected... No priest can or should take part in conflicts of political parties without compromising his clerical status and the Church herself. But at the same time the mission of the Church cannot be circumscribed within her temples."

The source of the present difficulty is what President Peron has termed "infiltration by the clergy" into the labor unions which for some time have constituted his strongest support and which of late have openly advocated independence from religious norms. Priests who have been promoting the principles set forth in the labor encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI have accordingly fallen into disfavor. Recent reports indicate that seven of them have been arrested for their "interference" in labor matters. *(Oss. Romano).*

* * *

THE LEBANON

Concluding Ceremonies for the Marian Year

Concluding ceremonies for Our Lady's Year in Lebanon were recently observed there with Cardinal Roncalli, the Patriarch of Venice, present as Papal Delegate. As part of the festivities the Liturgy was celebrated in six different rites at outdoor altars set up for the purpose at Beirut. Priests who participated belonged to the Maronite, Melkite, Chaldean, Armenian, Syrian, and Latin Rites.

Referring to the manifestations of devotion inspired by the Marian Year in the Lebanon, Cardinal Tappouni, the Syrian Catholic Patriarch at Beirut, remarked that even non-Christians shared in paying homage to the Mother of the Saviour. "Not only have members of the Orthodox Church asked for Our Lady's statue to be brought into their own parishes as well as the Catholic ones," he said. "but even more remarkable, Muslims and Druzes have also been joining in public hymn-singing and services of devotion to the Blessed Virgin."

Druzes are members of a semi-secret religious sect for the most part inhabiting the mountains of the Lebanon, Anti-Lebanon, and Hauran. *(C. Herald)*

* * *

AUSTRALIA

Association Begun for Australian Biblical Scholars

His eminence, Norman Cardinal Gilroy, Archbishop of Sydney, has begun a Catholic Biblical Association which will serve as a fellowship of professional Scripture scholars.

The first association of its kind in Australia, it will promote the study of the Bible in accordance with the instructions of the Holy See

and will make use of the most progressive methods of Biblical research. It will also promote communication between Australian Catholic teachers of Sacred Scripture and will be of assistance to those instructing Christian doctrine.

By lectures, conferences, and eventually through a journal devoted to scriptural matters, the association will dedicate itself to the propagation and popularization of Bible knowledge. Father William Leonard, an authority on the Scriptures, is chairman of the new organization. (NC)

* * *

DENMARK

Government Aids Construction of Catholic School

At Lyngby, Denmark, in the month of November, Bishop John Theodore Suhr, O.S.B. was present at the blessing of a new Catholic parochial school which had been erected with the assistance of government funds. In his address to mark the occasion, Bishop Suhr, whose see is at Copenhagen, expressed his gratification at the fact that it was not only possible to build such a school in Denmark, but that it could be undertaken with government support. This, he declared, was a real tribute to Danish democracy.

"If we consider," said Bishop Suhr, "the battle for schools that is now going on in some European countries, we may look upon the circumstance that the state in our land not only tolerates Catholic school undertakings, but even aids them, as a sign of genuine democracy."

Danish Catholics form a small minority in a land where more than 95 per cent of the people nominally belong to the Lutheran State Church. According to the latest figures available, Denmark numbers some 26,000 Catholics in a population of 4,240,000. *(Oss. Romano)*

* * *

INDONESIA

Belief in Communism Declared a Sin for Moslems

The cause of communism was dealt a heavy blow in Indonesia recently when Moslem leaders in that country declared that it would be sin on the part of any Moslem to believe in that system.

This statement, which is far-reaching in its effects, was made by clerical leaders of the Masjumi Party's West Java branch. Masjumi is the extensive Moslem political party in Indonesia and is believed to be the nation's largest. Its aim is to make the country officially Moslem. The West Java branch is the party's largest affiliate.

Masjumi's clerical leaders, who met in November to study communism, found it strictly forbidden for Moslems. They declared that it goes against Islamic teaching and endangers the Indonesian Republic as well as the nation's religious life. (NC)

BOOK REVIEWS

LOUIS BOUYER: *From Protestantism to the Church.* (Collection *Unam Sanctam*) Paris: ed. du Cerf, 1954.

This book by Fr. Bouyer is one of those works about which one feels almost hesitant in presenting it or in giving a summary of it because it imposes itself so completely on the interest of the reader with that note of personal experience which no translator can adequately convey. For in this case we are not dealing with just another study—however learned it might be and however reputable the documents and principles from which it might be drawn. As the author states in his preface: "this book is a witness. It simply sets forth the way in which adherence to the Catholic Church came about in the consciousness of a Protestant. It is not a question of expressing an aversion for the religion which his Protestant boyhood, his youth, and his years in the ministry had nourished in him. That religion, to tell the truth, he has never disowned."

In this book, therefore, one will not find what is all too common in so many controversial works: caustic criticism, a disparagement of everything that bears the name of Protestant, and an unvarying partiality for everything that is termed Catholic. Nevertheless, one will neither find in it any compromise with error—that false irenicism which is denounced in the encyclical *Humani Generis* as a counterfeit of genuine charity. To Protestants of good will, Fr. Bouyer wishes to show that what is more authentically Christian in the Reformation not only is not in opposition to true Catholicism, but can be claimed as its normal and necessary development. To Catholics who are too readily given to unqualified condemnation or to over-complacency, he wishes to recall the necessity not only of facing the truth, but also of a constant deepening of their religious life and of their charity towards all those for whom Christ died on the Cross.

The first section of Fr. Bouyer's work sets in array the positive principles of the Reformation, such as they are still exhibited by many Protestant communities today (chap. 1), and according as historical inquiry into the origin of the movement brings them to light: the basic principle of the gratuity of salvation, the pure gift of God which faith alone can receive (chap. 2), and which, in opposition to every form of Pelagianism, manifests the sovereignty of God; the principle of the supreme authority of the Scriptures (chap. 6), reaffirmed so forcefully in our day by Karl Barth. Continuing his thesis, Fr. Bouyer demonstrates with cogency how many basic affirmations of the Protestant Reformation, far from constituting contradictions or forming a barrier, actually concord with the profound character of the Catholic teaching of every age.

At this point the author declares: "If in Protestantism there were to be found only what we have exposed thus far, schism—and most of all the heresies which have accompanied it—would be inexplicable" (p. 145).

If, therefore, Protestants have separated themselves from the Church, or if you will, the Church has rejected them, it is because the positive elements which indeed make up the essential character of the Reformation have been mingled with other elements which the Church cannot accept. It is this theme which serves as the object of the second part of Fr. Bouyer's book.

To the principle of "grace alone" there is joined a theory about "forensic' justification, ending in the negation of any real interior transformation of the sinner and of all merit. The sovereign authority of the Sacred Scriptures comes to be understood as excluding the authority of the Church. "One could say," writes Fr. Bouyer, "that an impossibility exists for systematic Protestant theology to accept the idea that God could place something of Himself in man in such wise that man might actually possess it and yet the gift remaining all the while with the Donor" (p. 162). The author traces the origin of this impossibility to the nominalist philosophy which profoundly influenced the reformers and which ultimately renders impossible any genuine participation, and even any real presence, of the supernatural in this world. The nominalism of Occam and of Biel, so widely diffused at the time of the Reformation, is accordingly considered responsible in large measure for Protestant error and also, in the estimation of the author, for the incapacity on the part of a good number of Catholic theologians—themselves under the influence of nominalist teaching—of disclosing the root causes of the evil.

An entire chapter is devoted next to the "death agony" of positive principles in the negative system of the Reformation. Fr. Bouyer here traces in broad strokes the evolution of Protestantism—always a source of surprise to the Catholic, whether it be of the "orthodox" kind or of "liberal" tendencies. Another chapter deals with Protestant "awakenings", those sudden movements of authentic religious life which can be ascertained periodically in the history of Protestantism as a form of reaction against disintegrating tendencies. Finally, a last treatment by the author, intended as the conclusion of what precedes, presents the Catholic Church as being necessary to the positive principles of the Reformation.

But that which our all too brief summary cannot convey is the general tone of this whole work, the respect with which Fr. Bouyer discusses all these problems, and the deeply religious nature of his exposition. His book evidently will not prove satisfactory to all his readers. Some Catholics, perhaps, will find it too severe in its condemnation of our ignorance and certain of our negligences. In the reviewer's opinion, however, the reading of such a work cannot help but prove beneficial to persons of good will. It is with genuine gratitude, then, that he joins Fr. G. Broglie in his attractive forward in duly thanking Fr. Bouyer for his notable contribution.

J. LEICUYER

RONDS POINTS, *Paul Couturier, apôtre de l'unité chrètienne. (Temoignages)* Lyons: E. Vitte, 1954, pp. 206.

As its subtitle indicates, this book is a collection of testimonials in memory of Abbé Couturier. In all, there are thirteen of them, made up of contributions by Catholics, Orthodox, Anglicans, and Protestants. Each of them is a moving study, and their ensemble gives a very good conception of the humble priest who for more than twenty years dedicated himself completely to the cause of the reunion of Christians. Upon completing this book, one is reminded of the eulogy paid by His Eminence Cardinal Gerlier to Abbé Couturier on the day of the latter's funeral: "He was a spendid servant of the Church" (p. 47).

Fr. Maurice Villain, who drew up this collection, is himself a spiritual son of Abbé Couturier. He accordingly begins with a brief but engaging biography of his master and strives to bring into relief the spirit of the man. One could define this spirit as being one of ardent charity which was deeply pained by the disunity among Christians; which manifested sincere love for those who were separated; and which worked and prayed —and stirred up others to pray—so that reunion might be realized. Abbé Couturier's chief activity was the diffusion of the Week of Prayer from the 18th to the 25th of January; this imposed upon him an unusually heavy task which lasted from November to the end of February.

One of the contributors to this volume, Dr. L. A. Zander, the Greek-Orthodox theologian, writes of Abbé Couturier: "He attracted all hearts; he was loved by everyone. But in this veneration it was not a matter of mere sentiment inspired within us by this congenial old man; what we loved was a priest of the Catholic Church praying for unity, celebrating (the Mass) for unity, and working for unity" (p. 107).

Abbé Couturier, who was not a theologian, could at times have employed inaccurate expressions; the audacity of his zeal sometimes seemed excessive. But his adherence to Catholic orthodoxy was clear. As the Rev. Jean de Saussure states at the beginning of his testimonial: "All of us knew it well, and never once did he on his part give us the least occasion to doubt it: our beloved and venerable Abbé Couturier was a priest entirely loyal to his Roman Catholic Church. Otherwise if this had not been the case, his work would have been without interest for us" (p. 153).

The Octave of prayer which Abbé Couturier propagated owes its origin, as we now, to Fr. Paul Wattson, at one time an Episcopalian, and later the founder of the Fathers of the Atonement. But the priest from Lyons believed it necessary to broaden its spirit in order to make it more acceptable to his separated brethren. However, one should not exaggerate this divergence. During the Octave we pray that all Christians might enjoy the unity which Jesus Christ has willed for His Church; this is a prayer that all Christians can make. It goes without saying, then, that as long as division exists, unity will not be understood by all in the same way. For Catholics, to pray for the unity of Chris-

tians is to pray that our separated brethren may enter the Roman Catholic Church. That which is essential to the Octave is that all Christians pray for the fulfillment of the will of Christ with respect to the unity of Christendom. The particular intentions can and are expected to be different, especially in the case of our separated brethren.

May the example of Abbé Couturier serve to raise up apostles of Christian unity. Pastor Roger Schütz, prior of the Community of Taizé, has included in his contribution an apt appreciation which throws light upon the endeavor of Abbé Couturier and which inspires us with hope. He writes: "God had chosen this man who during his life had maintained himself in a hidden life of communion with Jesus Christ; He had chosen this priest who remained unknown up to the threshold of his old age in order to be the promotor of a movement the promised extension of which he himself had not been able to measure."

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

INDEX FOR 1954

ARTICLES

BOYER, CHARLES, S.J.,
The Theme of the Evanston Conference ..... I, 3
The Marian Year and Protestants ..... II, 83
Ecumenism and Theology ..... II, 86
The Message of the Evanston Assembly ..... III, 151
Why is One a Protestant? - A Controversy between Two Ministers III, 153
St. Augustine and the Unity of the Church ..... IV, 223
The Evanston Assembly - An Evaluation ..... IV, 225

DEMANN, PAUL,
Israel and the Unity of the Church ..... III, 169

DE VRIES, W., S.J.,
The Separated East under the Shadow of Moscow ..... II, 96

GILL, JOSEPH, S.J.,
"Catholic" and "Protestant" - Three Lines of Approach ..... I, 7
Reflections on "The Conversion of England" ..... IV, 233

GRUMEL, VENANCE, A.A.,
The Schism of Michael Cerularius in 1054 ..... I, 28

HANAHOE, EDWARD, S.A.,
Two Early Documents on Reunion ..... I, 38
The Mission of the Chair of Unity Octave ..... IV, 229

QUENARD, G., A.A.,
Vladimir Solovyev: a Herald of Unity ..... III, 175

VAN DE POL, W.H.,
The Problem of Unity ..... II, 91
Ecumenical Standpoints ..... III, 157

V. A.,
A Greek Bishop on the Problem of Reunion ..... I, 21

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

Two Early Documents on Reunion
a) A Letter of the Holy Office to the English Bishops ..... I, 41
b) Address from Anglican Clergy to Cardinal Patrizi ..... I, 44
c) Answer of His Eminence Cardinal Patrizi to Foregoing Letter ..... I, 45
The Archbishop of Canterbury's Views on Unity - and a Reply ... II, 119

THE EASTERN CHURCHES

Roman Catholic and Orthodox - An Appeal for Unity ..... III, 196
The Reunion Formula of Hormisdas ..... IV, 241

THE LUTHERAN CHURCHES

An Important Appeal to German Lutherans ..... II, 116
Another Letter of Dr. Asmussen to German Evangelicals ..... III, 193

THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

Towards a Sound Ecumenical Movement - A Communication from Taizé ..... II, 121
The Text of the Evanston Message ..... III, 191

OTHER DOCUMENTS

Pastoral Letter of His Eminence, Samuel Cardinal Stritch ..... III, 180
Union and Tolerance - A Comment by Douglas Woodruff ..... II, 50

THE CHAIR OF UNITY OCTAVE

The Octave Observance in 1954

in Italy ..... I, 53
in France ..... I, 55
in England ..... I, 56
in Germany ..... I, 57
in the United States ..... I, 58
in Holland ..... I, 59
in Spain ..... I, 60
in India ..... I, 60
Other Observances ..... I, 60
Mission of the Chair of Unity Octave ..... IV, 229

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

CHURCH RELATIONS

Efforts for Better Understanding between Catholics and Protestants I, 62
Dissident Group in India Reunites with the Catholic Church ..... I, 63
Union Plan for American Presbyterians ..... II, 130
Plan for Major Church Merger in Canada ..... IV, 262
Jubilee Year of Reunion in Malabar ..... IV, 263
First National Assembly of Una Sancta at Berlin ..... III, 207

THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

History of the Ecumenical Movement ..... I, 61
Students Seek Greater Unity ..... I, 62
New Ecumenical Quarterly in French ..... I, 64
Ecumenical Youth Congress at Amsterdam ..... II, 129
Church of Scotland Statement on Ecumenism ..... II, 131
New Semester at Graduate School of Ecumenical Studies ..... IV, 262

THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

General Secretary of W.C.C. Speaks in New York ..... I, 61
The World Council Message for Pentecost ..... II, 128
World Council Again Sponsors Week of Prayer for Unity ..... IV, 265
Anglican Periodical Questions Title of World Council ..... IV, 264

THE EVANSTON ASSEMBLY

Karl Barth on the Evanston Assembly ..... I, 63
A Background for the Evanston Assembly ..... I, 63
The Eve of the Evanston Assembly ..... II, 127
The Second Assembly of the W.C.C. at Evanston ..... III, 199
After the Evanston Assembly ..... IV, 260
Publications of the Evanston Assembly ..... IV, 261

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

World Anglican Convention at Minneapolis ..... II, 129
Anglican Prelate Opposes United Services ..... II, 130

Anglican World Congress at Minneapolis ..... III, 205
American Church Union Sponsors Congress for Unity ..... III, 206
Anglican Periodical Questions Title of W.C.C. ..... IV, 264

AROUND THE WORLD

AFRICA

Catholic Gains in French African Territories ..... III, 216

ALGERIA

Chapel of St. Augustine Believed to have been Discovered ..... I, 73

ARGENTINA

Catholic Bishops Reply to Peron ..... IV, 271

AUSTRALIA

Association Begun for Australian Bible Scholars ..... IV, 272

BELGIUM

Ukrainian Catholic Celebrations in Brussels ..... I, 69

BULGARIA

New Government Committee on Religious Affairs ..... II, 142

BURMA

First Native Burmese Bishop ..... II, 143

CANADA

Quebec Center of Prayer for Reunion ..... IV, 264

CHINA

Late Mission Statistics ..... I, 73

DENMARK

Government Aids Construction of Catholic School ..... IV, 273

ENGLAND

Mass for Cardinal Mindszenty ..... I, 67
Catholic Statistics ..... I, 68
250 Anglican Sermons by Newman Discovered ..... II, 138
Bishop of Southwork Explains Catholic Stand on Christian Unity III, 212

EGYPT

Franciscan Study Center Opened in Cairo ..... II, 142

FRANCE

Eight Eastern Rite Parishes for Paris ..... I, 68
Rouen Cathedral Re-opened to the Public ..... II, 136
Plenary Assembly of the French Hierarchy ..... II, 136
French Social Week ..... II, 137
Separated Armenians Join Pilgrimage to Lourdes ..... III, 213

New Ordinariate for Eastern Rite Catholics in France ..... III, 213
French Social Week Celebrates Fiftieth Anniversary ..... III, 214

GERMANY

Catholic Gains Reported in West Germany ..... I, 69
Papal Letter Calls Red Persecution Probably Worst Ever ..... II, 139
Twelfth Centenary of Martyrdom of St. Boniface ..... II, 139
German Catholics Preparing for 1954 Katholikentag ..... II, 140
Salzburg Academic Weeks to Commemorate St. Augustine ..... II, 140
Mass being Said in 700 Protestant Churches in East Germany ... II, 141
Seventy-sixth Observance of National Catholic Day ..... III, 214

HOLLAND

Protestant Participation in St. Boniface Celebrations Termed 'Hopeful' ..... III, 215

INDIA

Cardinal Tisserant's Radio Message ..... I, 71
New Eastern Rite See Established ..... I, 72
Episcopal Promotions for Syro-Malankara Church ..... I, 72

INDONESIA

Belief in Communism Declared a Sin for Moslems ..... IV, 273

IRAQ

New Archdiocese Established for the Chaldeans ..... I, 74
Appointment of Two New Prelates for Chaldean Church ..... II, 144

ITALY

Italian State Grants Recognition to Protestant Sect ..... IV, 269

JAPAN

Research Reveals Forgotten Marian Holyday ..... III, 215

LEBANON

Concluding Ceremonies for Marian Year ..... IV, 272

MEXICO

Anti-religious Restrictions Still in Force ..... II, 143

NORWAY

Lutheran Primate Views Tension between Church and State ..... I, 71

ROME

Marian Year Art Exhibit Planned ..... I, 64
Progress Made at Vatican Library ..... I, 64
Holy Father Receives New British Envoy ..... I, 65
New Edition of Vatican Year Book ..... I, 65
Pope Calls Pius X Providential Saint of our Times ..... II, 132
Vatican Newspaper Advocates Internationalization of Jerusalem ... III, 209
Providential Care of Church Avowed by Pope Pius ..... III, 209
Solemn Closing of Marian Year ..... IV, 267
Pope Denies Church's Role Limited to Strictly Religious Matters IV, 268
Russian Pontifical College Observes 25th Anniversary ..... IV, 268

SOUTH KOREA

2000 Converts Baptized during Holy Saturday Rites ..... II, 143

SWITZERLAND

Pastoral Letter Treats of Our Lady and Christian Unity ..... I, 70
Swiss Catholics Appeal for Equal Rights ..... I, 70
Christian Optimism Counselled by Pope to Swiss Catholics ..... II, 141

UNITED STATES

New Quarterly Publication of Papal Texts ..... I, 66
Compilation of Papal Statements on World Affairs ..... I, 67
Sixteenth Annual Conference on Eastern Rites and Liturgies at Fordham ..... II, 133
Russian Center at Fordham Seeking New Objectives ..... II, 134
Latest Catholic Statistics ..... II, 135
Two Lutheran Ministers Become Catholics ..... II, 135
New York Times Survey on World Religions ..... II, 135
Use of English Sanctioned in Administration of Sacraments ..... III, 210
Better Attitude toward Religion in American Colleges ..... III, 211
President of World Brotherhood Commends Cardinal's Stand ..... III, 211
Annual Message of Catholic Bishops ..... IV, 269
Eastern Rite Congress in Philadelphia ..... IV, 270
Religious Statistics ..... IV, 271

BOOK REVIEWS

ARSENAULT, SIMON, S.V.,

Ut Sint Unum - An Appeal to Apostles of Unity (D. Stiernon, A.A.) II, 148

BOUYER, LOUIS,

From Protestantism to the Church (J. Leicuyer) ..... IV, 274

HANAHOE, EDWARD F., S.A.,

Catholic Ecumenism (Raymond P. Etteldorf) ..... I, 77

A History of the Ecumenical Movement (1517-1948)

Edited by Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill (J. Gill, S.J.).... III, 217

HUGHES, PHILIP,

The Reformation in England: Part II, Religio depopulata (J. Gill, S.J.) ..... I, 75

St. Paul's Mission to Greece

Nineteenth Centenary. A Volume of Commemoration compiled by H.S. Alivasatos, D.D., General Secretary to the St. Paul Festival Committee (Dunstan Donovan, S.A.) ..... II, 146

ROND POINTS, *Paul Couturier, apôtre de l'unité chrétienne. (Temoignages)* (C. Boyer, S.J.) ..... IV, 275

SELLERS, R.V.,

The Council of Chalcedon (J. Gill, S.J.) ..... II, 145

DAPCO - VIA DANDOLO, 8 ROMA

THE UNITAS ASSOCIATION

is an international organization whose purpose it is to promote the spiritual union of men and especially of Christians. It was founded in Rome in 1945 by a group of professors and writers, priests and laymen; and in June of that year received the blessing of Pope Pius XII. Fr. Charles Boyer, S.J., Dean of the Theological Faculty of the Gregorian University in Rome, was elected president of the Association and also serves as editor of its organ Unitas *which appears in three editions: English, French, and Italian.*

Established at the center of Catholicity, the Unitas Association in carrying on its activities endeavors to follow with studied perfection the guidance of the Holy See. In striving to fulfill its purpose, it attempts to regulate its mission in accordance with the following principles:

To Catholics it recalls the benefits of the unity which they enjoy and the duty which is incumbent upon them to pray for those who are deprived of it. The Association invites the active co-operation of Catholics and exhorts them to keep ever before them the advice of Pope Pius XI: "This unity ought to be promoted less by discussion or other means than by the example of a saintly life".

To its separated brethren of the Eastern Churches, it speaks of those long glorious centuries of union when the Doctors of the East illumined the universal Church and triumphed with their Latin brethren over the most subtle and distressing heresies. Unitas lays stress upon all that the separated East has preserved in common with Catholics: the priesthood, the Sacraments, the cult of the Blessed Virgin Mary. It makes clear the duty of union and strives to eliminate the barriers which prejudice and resentment have in the course of the centuries erected between Christians of the East and West.

To Anglicans and Protestants, Unitas reveals the genuine character of the Roman Catholic Church. Across the imperfections of men, it tries to make evident that spirit of fraternal affection and faithfulness to the teachings of Christ which is at the very heart of the Church's life and the manifestation of the Holy Spirit at work in her. Finally, Unitas keeps in close touch with the Ecumenical Movement, and endeavors to aid it in its quest for unity.

* * *

The Unitas Association has affiliated groups in Italy, France, Belgium, Canada, and Turkey. All that is necessary to form a group of this kind to further the aim of Christian unity is that a small number of persons of good will plan their organization, obtain the approval of their bishop, and then make their step known to the Central Committee of the Association in Rome.

NONCIRCULATING